

THE
REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW

No. 2.—APRIL—1915.

I.

JOHN HUSS AND THE REFORMED CHURCH.

JAMES I. GOOD.

Five hundred years ago (July 6, 1415) John Huss was burned at the stake at Constance, Germany. Has that any special meaning to our Reformed Church?

Of course, as Huss was martyred a century before our Church was born, he had no direct contact with our Church. And yet he had, through his followers the Hussites. That their relation to us was especially intimate is shown by the following fact: On August 26, 1618, there was elected as King of Bohemia, Elector Frederick V. of the Palatinate, the grandson of Elector Frederick III. of the Palatinate, who caused our Heidelberg Catechism to be written. So our prince became ruler of Bohemia. But, alas, it was not for long. For only one brief year, he was their "Winter King." And on November 8, 1620, he and his army were utterly defeated by Ferdinand, the Catholic emperor of Germany, at the battle of White Mountain, a few miles west of Prague. In that awful defeat, not merely did Bohemian Protestantism go down to destruction, but also our fair land of the Palatinate in western Germany went down with her. So then the Hussites and our Ger-

man Reformed Church were compassed in the same destruction—they were brothers in the same suffering. For Frederick was not merely put off the throne of Bohemia, but also deposed from the Palatinate. And as in Bohemia so in the Palatinate, Protestantism was forbidden. For thirty years both they and we suffered as the Catholic powers ravaged our lands. Then, at the end of the Thirty Years War, relief came to our fathers as the Palatinate regained its rights. And so that Church was preserved to later found our Church in America. But for it, we would have been blotted out as was the Hussite Church.

Because of this historical coincidence, there ought to be a very tender tie between our Church and the followers of John Huss. We should therefore be greatly interested in Huss who gave them their beginning and has in all the years been their inspiration. And we should therefore join in the observance of the five hundredth anniversary of Huss's death, that, as it gave the Hussites such great inspiration, it may also give us an inspiration and benediction.

There are especially four links between the Hussites and our Reformed Church that make this Huss anniversary significant to us.

The first was forged at the reformation. In the reformation the followers of Huss came at first into contact with the Lutherans who were geographically nearer to Bohemia. But by 1540 they came into contact with the Reformed and the Reformed with them. Church discipline especially was the link that drew them together. The Hussites separated more and more from the Lutherans because of their laxity of discipline, both in their churches and universities, and so they came nearer the Reformed because they emphasized discipline. Bucer, when he heard of the Hussites, wrote to them, inquiring about their Church discipline. And when he had received a copy of it, he could not restrain his tears. He went to the other Strassburg reformers who were sitting near and said, "This is a more heavenly Church government than earthly." And when one of the Bohemian brethren who had come to Strassburg apologized

for the lack of scholarship in his address, Bucer replied that "the Christian must not look on the elegance of the words but on the piety," and he added, "It is God's work, that these uneducated people have been so exalted a Church." The reformers of Strassburg, including Calvin, then sent back to Bohemia commendatory letters except on their celibacy. Later John A'Lasco, the founder of the Reformed Church of Poland, sent their confession to the reformers of Switzerland. These at first criticized it somewhat on the sacraments, for the Bohemians had, in 1535, revised their confession so as to make it more agreeable to the Lutherans with whom they were then in contact. It was these Lutheranizing expressions in it that did not quite suit the Swiss. But after explanations of it were made by the Hussites, it was evident that they agreed most with Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper and so Calvin was satisfied at last.

It was however especially through our Reformed Church at Heidelberg that the Bohemians became intimate with the Reformed Church of Germany. This was due to two facts —Dr. Crato, of Craftheim, who, although a Protestant, was the court physician of three of the emperors of Germany, and therefore had great influence at court, had saved them from persecution by the emperor. He was the man who had educated Ursinus, one of the authors of the Heidelberg Catechism.¹ So he was the link between them and Ursinus at Heidelberg. The other fact was that Hubert Languet, a university friend of Ursinus, advised them to send their young men who wanted an education to Heidelberg University, and in 1575 they first began coming there. After that, all their young men who went abroad for their education went to Reformed universities. And when they went back to Bohemia, their commanding influence virtually made the Bohemians Reformed in spirit. There was no union as yet with the Reformed, it is true; for the Bohemians were not permitted by the Austrian government to unite with any foreign Church. Indeed, they had been perse-

¹ See my work "The Heidelberg Catechism in its Newest Light."

cuted for being merely in correspondence with foreign Reformed churches. But we see that their relation to us became as close as it possibly could under the circumstances.

The second link between the Bohemians and us was the one we have already mentioned. Our prince of the Palatinate became their king in 1619. When he was elected the hope was expressed that by it the Reformed of Germany and the Hussite Church might be brought together. A number of their Bohemian cities and congregations became Reformed, especially those that were democratic. But the defeat at White Mountain and the awful destruction that came on Bohemia later led to other links that made them Reformed. So we pass to the third link between the Hussites and our German Reformed Church, and that was that of the Hussites who fled to Germany, most of whom became members of the Reformed Church. The awful persecutions that followed the battle of White Mountain caused thousands of the followers of Huss to flee to other lands. Many of them went to Poland, so that there were soon, it is said, sixty congregations there. The Hussites in Poland merged with the Reformed in 1628, says Rev. Dr. Herman Dalton, the historian of the Reformed Church of Poland and Russia. When Poland was divided, the district in which these Hussite churches were located fell to Prussia. And there is now a Reformed synod in eastern Germany, the synod of Posen, which is composed of the descendants of these Hussites. There are also in Silesia some Reformed congregations founded by the Hussites. In Berlin there is a Reformed congregation, the Bethlehem congregation, composed of descendants of the Hussites who named that church after Huss's chapel at Prague. Perhaps most interesting of all, in order to show how thoroughly these followers of Huss became part of our Reformed Church, we may refer to Rev. D. E. Jablonski, of Berlin. He was of Hussite parentage, the grandson of Comenius, the great educator of Europe in the seventeenth century. Jablonski was the court-preacher or head of the Reformed Church of Prussia, and at the same time and for many years the senior or head of the Hussite Church. He

it was who ordained Zinzendorf as head of the "Renewed Hussites," as the Moravians are called. We thus see that an important constituency of our Reformed Church of Germany came out of these Hussites.

The fourth and last link between the followers of Huss and our Church is the present "Reformed Church of Bohemia and Moravia," numbering about 120,000. This church, like ourselves, adheres to the Heidelberg Catechism. What a story is theirs, and how it ought to appeal to us, as we remember how nearly our Church came to being destroyed with theirs in the Thirty Years War (1618-48). Our Church at that time suffered with them, but after thirty years gained relief and was reestablished. But their Church got no relief for 160 years, until, in 1781, Emperor Joseph of Austria issued the Edict of Toleration. The Bohemian church had been dead for six generations and was supposed to have passed out of existence. But lo, what a resurrection! It is one of the miracles of church history. Where there were no Protestants before, lo, 90,000 came out and avowed themselves Protestants! How was it that without churches or sacraments or ministers they had preserved their faith for a century and a half. We remember many years ago being shown by our sainted brother, Elder Rudolph Kelker, then treasurer of our Foreign Mission Board, a baked Bible. The story connected with it was, that it had belonged to a Bohemian family during their persecutions. And when the Catholic soldiers or Jesuits came around, the family would hide it in dough which they would place in the oven. It came out with the loaf, baked—but preserved. The present superintendent of the Bohemian Reformed Church, Rev. Mr. Dusek, told us that the reason why the followers of Huss so highly honored their Bibles was because, as they had no pastors or churches, all they had was their Bibles. And therefore they cherished them all the more. These Bibles were secreted in hollow logs or under stones or in caves, etc., so as not to be discovered. And often their hiding place was only known to the father of the family who, just before dying, would disclose it to his son.

When this Bohemian Church was again resurrected in 1781 they were not allowed to become Hussites. The Austrian government ordered them to become either Lutheran or Reformed, as they were the only two Protestant Churches recognized thereby law. It would have been easier for them to have become Lutherans, as it was easier to get Lutheran pastors. But they did not like the high churchism of the Lutheran ministers, who came among them with their robes, altars and crucifixes. Therefore, most of them became Reformed—three-fourths it is said—which would mean about 65,000.

But how were they to get Reformed ministers? Here comes in one of the most interesting tales in their history. The nearest Reformed Church was in Hungary, and to it they appealed. In September, 1782, their letters were read at a large meeting in the University of Saros Patak, Hungary, and finally four of the young Hungarian theological students declared their willingness to do. They were ordained by the Reformed Church of Hungary as "Apostles to Bohemia." But their difficulties were very great. One of them was the language. The Hungarian and Bohemian languages are quite different, as different as French and German. So these young ministers, who then spoke only Hungarian, had at first to prepare their sermon in Hungarian, then translate it into Latin, and then, by the aid of a Latin-Bohemian dictionary, translate it into Bohemian. But even then their pronunciation was at first very imperfect. We fear that many of our modern sermons today would go to pieces under such a process. But they persevered and by and by became eloquent in Bohemian.

And their congregations, how did they receive these first imperfect attempts to preach? Let any of our Reformed congregations who are hypercritical sit up and listen to the story. They did not criticize the mistakes of the preacher as do our congregations now. No, they were too hungry for the gospel, after a famine of 160 years, to do that. It is said that when they heard the first sermon in their own tongue, even at the beginning when the text was read, a great agitation went over

the congregation. And many of them, especially those who had suffered persecutions, wept; but they were not tears of sorrow, but of joy at hearing the gospel of their fathers in their own tongue. Think of the self-denial of those young Hungarians as they went to found the Reformed Church of Bohemia. No wonder their descendants, who are today in the ministry as Szalatnay, Nagy and Molnar, are looked up to with special honor as "Sons of Aaron." Thus these Hussites in Bohemia became Reformed and are today devotedly attached to the Heidelberg Catechism.

We thus see how closely the followers of Huss were originally connected with the Reformed Church, until finally the most of them went into the Reformed Church. The little colony who became what we call Moravians numbered only 300 when they first left Moravia; but those who went to Poland, whose descendants became Reformed, numbered many thousands. And when we add to them the Reformed Church of Bohemia and Moravia, we see that by far the greater part of the original Hussites are today in the Reformed Church.

For these reasons, we of the Reformed Church ought to observe this anniversary of the martyrdom of Huss and be interested in his present followers in Bohemia. We can therefore count Huss as a pre-reformer of our Church, paving the way for Zwingli, Calvin and Ursinus. For had not Huss and the Hussite movement shown the easiness with which a nation like Bohemia could break away from Rome and get along without a pope, it would have been harder for the reformers of the sixteenth century to have gained the victory.

Four celebrations of Huss have been planned for this year.² The first is a great national celebration by the Bohemians as a nation. Huss has ever been the national idol of Bohemia, for he was their leader when they first came to national consciousness. Though the Romish Church has for centuries tried to undermine his influence among the Bohemians, Huss is still their great national hero. And though most of the Bohemians

² The European war may prevent some of them.

are Catholics, yet they admire and love Huss from a political point of view. Therefore, the Bohemian nation proposes to place a great statue of Huss in the Central Square of Prague, strange to say just on the spot where the Protestant nobles of Bohemia were beheaded in 1621 for their faith.

The second celebration is to be by the Freethinkers of the world. But Huss was not a freethinker. He was too devoted to his Bible for that.

The third is, strange to say, by the Romish Church. It is hard to see what she has to celebrate, unless it be her perfidy in breaking Huss's safe-conduct at Constance and putting to death one of the purest and most devoted of her sons. Doubtless, the great influence of Huss among the people compels them to have some sort of celebration.

The fourth will be by the Reformed Church of Bohemia and Moravia. And shall we who are of the same faith and order not join with them in this observance? If Catholics and even infidels intend to observe it, are we going to be worse than they? Certainly we will show our sympathy for that suffering but noble Church by joining with them in it as our last General Synod has ordered. It is therefore hoped that each pastor will in his congregation or charge, on a date as near to next July 6 as is most convenient, preach a sermon and hold a Huss service. This is to be done for the education of his people, but also for the inspiration they will get from the story of Huss and his followers. And if the interest of the congregation is sufficiently great he will take an offering to aid that struggling sister church of ours in Bohemia. For though that Church is now over a century old, yet it does not yet have its own theological seminary. It is the only national Church of Europe that does not have its own school of the prophets. It is proposed, therefore, to erect in Prague a Huss House as a memorial to Huss. This is to contain a theological seminary and also to be a center for the Church in its work and especially in its work among the students of the University of Prague. The Congregationalists of our country, though not allied to the Bohemian

Church in faith or government as we are, is putting \$6,000 to \$8,000 into their mission in Bohemia every year. Can we, who are so much nearer than they, afford to do less for a church that loves our Heidelberg Catechism. Any money that is raised can be sent to the chairman or members of the committee of our General Synod, Rev. Drs. Good, Richards, and John Gekeler, who will be glad to forward it.

We ought therefore to observe this anniversary, not merely for the sake of the Hussites, who have been so closely related to our Church, but also for the inspiration that comes from their founder John Huss. A life like that of Huss, completed and crowned by so brave a martyrdom, will be a great inspiration to ministers and congregations alike. It will tone us up in this luxurious age to greater self-sacrifice and nobler Christian living. It is true, Huss had his faults—who has not. Thus he held to transubstantiation; unless the charge of his enemies that he held to the doctrine of remanence (that is, that the bread and wine remain bread and wine and are not all changed into the body and blood of Christ) contain an element of truth in it. But we can overlook his faults; for above all his faults rise his greater virtues. It was for his essential Protestantism that he gave his life.

We might suggest in closing a few of the lessons that might be dwelt upon at this anniversary.

1. Huss stands out as the Champion of the Supremacy of the Word of God. Like Wyckliffe, whose follower he was, the Bible was his great guide and theme. It was for Bible-reading and Bible-preaching that he became a martyr.

2. He stands out as the great Apostle of Congregational Singing. The Romish Church had robbed the congregations of this privilege and caused all the singing to be done by the priests. Huss restored singing to the congregation and made the Hussites great hymn-singers; so mighty, that by the singing of their national religious hymn, they repeatedly put great armies of their enemies to flight. We have congregational singing in our churches today because Huss started it and Luther and Calvin followed him.

3. Huss stands out as the great Slav Reformer, the only prominent reformer among the Slav races. The gospel of Huss is the one that especially appeals to the races allied to the Bohemians, like the Poles, Slavs, Ruthenians, Lithuanians, Russians, etc., who are just opening up to our pure gospel of Protestantism.

4. Huss stands out as the great Champion of Religious Liberty—so does in fact every martyr for that matter. But Huss was one of the first of them for Protestantism. He demanded the right to believe according to his own conscience. And they burned him for it. Would we in America be enjoying our cherished religious liberty if Huss had not blazed the way so long ago?

5. Huss stands out as a Christian so entirely devoted to his faith that he was ready to die for it. What a lesson this to our Church and how great the appeal we can make from it to our members to be true to their Reformed faith and churches.

6. Huss stands out lastly as the man who was willing to die for his conscience. We have not thus far referred to the reasons for his martyrdom, as they are well known, but we will close with one that is apt to be overlooked. Huss died so as to keep his conscience pure. Would that our people today were as anxious to keep their consciences pure and undefiled. He would probably not have been put to death, if he had been willing to falsely grant that he held to the errors the Catholics charged against him. He declared to the emperor "I can not offend God by saying I held to heresies I never held." He would rather die than violate his conscience. He held it was better to burn than hold to truths his soul abhorred, such as that he was the fourth person of the trinity. He could not do it, he did not do it, and so they burned him. But you can't burn out a conscience like that any more than you can annihilate a soul. You can martyr it as Huss was martyred, but Huss still lives on the earth; for his principles have become immortal here.

Listen to the story of his death. "God is my witness," he said, "that I have never taught or preached those things which

have falsely been ascribed to me, and the chief aim of my preaching, writing and acts has been that I might save men from sin. And today I am willing and glad to die for the truth which I have taught, written and preached." They put on his head a paper crown a yard long with three demons painted on it clawing his soul with their nails. And Huss said, "The crown that my Redeemer wore was heavier and more painful than this." The priests said, "We commit your soul to the devil." "And I," said Huss, with clasped hands and upturned eyes, "commit my soul to the most gracious Lord Jesus." And thus he closed his life, fulfilling his own motto given in one of his letters two years before. "It is better to die well than live badly."

When we think of all this, is it not worth while observing this saint's martyrdom? O that we had men and women of such consciences today!

They climbed the steep ascent of heaven
Through peril, toil and pain.
O God, to us may grace be given
To follow in their train.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

II.

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ANCIENT AND MEDIAEVAL MISSIONS.

(*Concluded.*)

LEONARD L. LEH.

When Paul began his missionary work, his usual method was to open his propaganda by preaching in the Jewish synagogues. In this way a good many of the Gentile seekers who attended these services were won. This method, however, could not long be continued, for the original distrust of the Jews for the new soon grew into active opposition. Even in Paul's time, practically all connection of Gentile Christianity with Judaism had perforce ceased. At Ephesus, as we are told in "the Acts," he preached for some time in the lecture hall of Tyrannus. At Athens, the city of learning, he followed the example of the philosophers and rhetoricians, and spoke to men in the streets and in a public assembly. It was very easy to get an audience in the time of the Empire; everywhere the people were eager to hear discourses about life, religion, and philosophy. We may therefore suppose that in the first years of Christianity, before active pagan opposition had begun, the usual method of the missionaries, just as in the case of Paul, was to address such audiences in all kinds of assemblies. Christian travelers, not bent particularly on a missionary errand, also lent their aid in the work by talking about the "Good News" they had discovered to all such as they came into conversation with. After the churches had sprung up, the preaching was largely confined to the churches themselves, but the unconverted were attracted to these meetings for the very same reason that they had previously attended the more public gatherings. They were

eager for truth, and here it seemed possible to find it. Besides the method of preaching there were other, more individualistic, ways of teaching people the new faith. Mature Christians, with their balanced life, their stately bearing, and their stores of wisdom, were looked upon, by many a pagan youth, in the same light as the philosophers who flourished at the time, and thus frequently were applied to for advice. It was in this way that the great Justin, after having studied several philosophies in vain, was won over. The deacons of the Church, whose business it was to look after the poor, also made good use of the opportunities their work presented to tell people of the blessedness of Christianity. Perhaps the most powerful and effective method of diffusion was that which took place in an altogether private and unofficial way. "One person told another where he had found peace and comfort—one laborer to another, one slave to a fellow-slave. What was heard was interchanged, as was also what was received in writing, a Gospel, it may be, or an apostolical Epistle." It is but natural to expect that these methods of spread brought into the folds of the Church a preponderance of the lower elements of society. This fact was a favorite point for the critics of Christianity to use against it. Celsus makes use of it in his satirical discussion of the "ecclesia of worms." "The Christians," he says, "tell us, 'Let no cultured person draw near, none wise, none sensible; for all that kind of thing we count evil; but if any man is ignorant, if he is wanting in sense and culture, if any is a fool, let him come boldly.' Such people they spontaneously avow to be worthy of their God; and, so doing, they show that it is only the simpletons, the ignoble, the senseless, slaves and womenfolk and children, whom they wish to persuade, or can persuade." The very fact, however, that Celsus was writing a lengthy and detailed refutation of Christianity, couched in all the subtleties of the diffusive rhetoric of the time, shows that it was not only the uncultured classes that were influenced by the religion, but betrays rather a fear that even the best of the Empire were at the point of being won over. During the persecutions the open

propaganda of Christianity ceased. Even the church gatherings had to be secret. Yet the work went on—greater crowds than ever came in. The persecutions did all the advertising that was necessary, while private contact with the members completed the work. We may well describe the mission method of early Christianity in the terms of a parable which Jesus himself used—that of the leaven. Jesus transmitted of his life, his personality, his new outlook upon life, to his disciples, and they to disciples of theirs, and so on, until the whole Empire was leavened.

The quality of culture in the persons addressed by early Christianity is shown by the manner in which the message was apprehended and the thoroughness with which it was applied. Wherever the new religion was adopted it was because men had become convinced of its inner truth. This convincing was accomplished in many different ways, but, whatever the manifestation or the occasion that brought it about, the result was always the same—the converts were convinced that here they had found the essence of life. In some the end was reached as the direct result of a long philosophical quest, as in the cases of Clement of Rome, Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian. More frequently, however, we may suppose, the occasion was rather a vision of the Christian life, of the tranquility and morality of the Church, the steadfastness of the martyrs, or similar objective manifestations. As a rule the conversion was the result of a long process. Men pondered what they had seen and heard, and finally, when the evidence had accumulated so as to be overwhelming, they also became Christians. There was a good deal of hesitancy on the part of most of the pagans before they allowed themselves to be persuaded. As Uhlhorn says, "Everything about (the new religion) was too strange to the heathen, too repugnant to the views with which they had been familiar from childhood, for them to be able to understand it." But this hesitancy made them all the better Christians when once they overcame it. The converts had a definite consciousness

of the change they had undergone. They felt that their life had been transformed down to its very foundations. They were now members of a new community which existed apart from the heathen world although it was still in its midst. The early Christians were very insistent upon this separateness of life. Theirs was a new course entirely from that of the heathen around them, and they felt that many things were forbidden to them which were matters of every-day custom to those about them. At the same time they realized the more strongly the new bond which bound them together as Christians. Thus were the converts to the new faith converts indeed, new in ideas, new in customs, and new in life. The extent of this transformation is seen in the indirect effect it had upon the still pagan world. An active element within a community, even though it is in the minority, helps greatly in the formation of the *Zeitgeist* of the period. Thus the Christian spirit had grown so strong in the Empire toward the end of the second century, that even the pagan world began to be possessed with Christian ideas of benevolence and charity, of purity in morals, and other characteristic Christian marks. Evidences of this new mood are seen in the facts that the lot of the miserable was greatly ameliorated, and that many institutions of benevolence were set upon their feet. The leaven was so strong that its influence touched even its avowed opponents.

As we have seen, the early Christian missions found their first fruit largely among the lower classes. Because of the new hope it instilled into the hearts of the despairing, and the new life and riches it brought to those most in need, the new religion would naturally make its first appeal to the down-trodden and oppressed. Besides, the lower classes are always the more easy to win over to a new movement, as they are more unstable than the ones holding position and privilege. But Christianity would not be confined to the lower circles—its appeal, then as now, was universal. Soon it had spread to the literary circles, and its tenets were widely proclaimed in

philosophical terms and in rhetorical dress. As early as 150, Justin Martyr wrote his splendid apology, addressed to the Roman Emperor. Even before that time, there had crept into the Church various Gnostic heresies, which, in themselves, were proof that the religion had a strong hold upon the philosophic. It is sometimes objected that there is a remarkable silence in regard to the new religion on the part of the pagan writers of the period. This fact, however, is not conclusive proof that it was unknown to them. Marcus Aurelius barely mentioned them in his *Meditations*, and yet he knew them well enough to fear that they threatened the old regime, and to institute an active persecution. May it not have been that the silence was studied? There are many indications that the accessions to Christianity from the better ranks were numerous. The presence of men of liberal education, such as Clement, Justin, etc., has already been spoken of. In periods of peace magnificent church buildings appeared in the cities. The contributions to charity were constant and generous from the time of Paul on. In the catacombs of the period we find costly crypts and tombs, which the Christians had made there. Clement of Alexandria, in his *Pædagogue*, inveighs against the vices of an opulent and luxurious community. These facts go to show that the Christians were not by any means all poor. In fact, they indicate a general prosperity, and even occasional wealth. A contemporary account of the martyrdom in Vienne and Lyons (177) seems to show that the martyrs were generally of the middle or better classes. Among those mentioned by name are several Roman citizens, heads of households, and a well-known physician. An edict of Valerian, dating from about the middle of the third century, gives evidence to the same effect: it provided that "bishops, presbyters, and deacons be immediately put to death; that senators and men of rank and knights be first of all deprived of their rank and property, and then, their means being taken away, if they still continue to be Christians, be also punished with death; that those in Cæsar's household who have for-

merly made profession of Christianity, or now profess it, be treated as Caesar's property, and, being put in chains, be distributed among the Imperial estates." Paul already spoke of "those of Caesar's household." Domitian, whose reign falls within the first century, felt constrained, even at that early period, to put to death Flavius Clemens, the consul, and to banish Domitilla, his own niece, for "atheism" and "going astray after the customs of the Jews," as Dio Cassius puts it. Toward the close of the second century there began to be a widespread dread, on the part of those who had the Empire at heart, at the increasing number and power of the Christians. This it was that called forth the book of Celsus. This also it was that made every capable emperor, from Marcus Aurelius to Diocletian, a stern persecutor of the faithful. This is another index of the extent to which the leaven of the Kingdom had worked. Tertullian may have exaggerated, yet he could not have written the following without some basis of truth: "Men cry out that the State is besieged; the Christians are in the fields, in the forts, in the islands; they mourn, as for a loss, that every sex, age, condition, and even rank, is going over to this sect. . . . The temple revenues are every day falling off; how few now throw in a contribution." When Constantine adopted Christianity as the state religion about 325, the conversion of the Empire was still far from complete; yet so strongly had it intrenched itself that the last obsequies of paganism as an institution were not far distant. When the Emperor Julian made it his life-work to restore the old faith, it did not take many years for him to discover that he was the champion of a lost cause. The knowledge of his inclinations filled his court with professors of paganism, but he could well see that enthusiasm was lacking. When he came to Antioch on his way to the East, he went with great pomp to celebrate the festival of Apollo at the Temple of Daphne, of former fame; but, to his great chagrin, when he arrived there he found no one but a single old priest, who was sacrificing a goose at his own expense. The days of paganism

were over. If the words that tradition attributes to Julian as he received his death-blow in battle were not spoken by him, they nevertheless express the unalterable truth that the situation represented: "Galilean, thou hast conquered!"

The missionaries of the Middle Ages were from the monasteries. The average layman was too busy with his own affairs to concern himself about bringing the Gospel to those who did not know it. If he did make it a matter of concern for himself, usually the only method he could think of, or that was adapted to his impetuous nature, as in the case of Charlemagne and the stubborn Saxons, was to convert them by a generous application of the sword. So the work of Christianizing the Teuton nations fell to the monks. The monks were men who made being a Christian their sole business. People had not learned then yet that the best way to be a Christian is to stay right in the midst of the world and its work, and then apply the principles of Christ there. They thought that to save his soul properly, a man must separate himself entirely from secular life and its temptations, and give himself up altogether to devotional and ascetic exercises. The monasteries were regarded, we might say, as spiritual gymnasia. Now many of the monks, having carried their previous worldliness inside the holy walls, forgot what they came for, and abandoned themselves to idleness and self-indulgence. Others kept their mission in mind, and subjected themselves to a very strenuous discipline, but they forgot the world and the Master's command to love. We are glad to say, however, that true Christianity, with its spirit of self-forgetting service, was not entirely shut out from the monasteries. There was a third group, and indeed they were fairly numerous, who were ever ready for any good work that might be given them to do. These soldiers of Christ were as steadfast and dauntless and devoted to their banner as ever were soldiers who marched under an earthly flag. Had it not been for these men, it is to be doubted whether there should ever have been any mission work in the Middle Ages. As it was, the great bishops

of the Church, who were anxious that the pagans should be brought into their fold, found ready tools for the work.

In the period that we are discussing, the missionary monks came from two sources. One series came from the Benedictine monasteries of Italy and adjacent lands, and were sent, for the most part, by the Roman bishop. The others came from the monasteries of the Irish Church, which at this time was entirely independent from Rome, having been cut off by the Anglo-Saxon invasion and maintained a separate existence up to this time. In both series do we find men of a high type, hard-working, self-sacrificing, and ready for almost any hardships if there was prospect that their task could be accomplished. There was a great difference, however, in the supporting power back of them. The monks of the Roman Church felt themselves the authorized representatives of a great, catholic ecclesiastical system, which had grown to be a power, even in the external or political sense, greater than any other in all western Europe. The Keltic missionaries came from a church that knew no higher organization than the individual monastery, and were impelled to the work, not by the order of some superior, but rather by their own vision of the need of Christ's cause. Naturally, this difference manifested itself in a difference in spirit of the men of the two forces. The purest type of Christianity was to be found among the Kelts. They had least in the way of worldly motives to confuse them. As for the Roman missionaries, giving them all due credit for their perseverance and uncomplaining self-sacrifice, we must admit that they displayed considerable haughtiness of spirit and impatience at opposition. One incident is enough to bring out this point. The Venerable Bede relates how Augustine, after he had come to Britain, appointed a synod where he might meet the bishops and learned men of the Keltic Church in order to discuss with them the question of church union. The Keltic representatives went to an old man, widely known for his piety and wisdom, asking his advice. The following is a quotation from

Bede: "He answered, 'If he [Augustine] is a man of God, follow him.' 'How shall we know that?' said they. He replied, 'Our Lord saith, Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me, for I am meek and lowly of heart; if, therefore, Augustine is meek and lowly of heart, it is to be believed that he has taken upon him the yoke of Christ, and offers the same to you to take upon you. But, if he is stern and haughty, it appears that he is not of God, nor are we to regard his words.' They insisted again, 'And how shall we discern even this?' 'Do you contrive,' said the anchorite, 'that he may first arrive with his company at the place where the synod is to be held; and if at your approach he shall rise up to you, hear him submissively, being assured that he is the servant of Christ; but if he shall despise you, and not rise up to you, whereas you are more in number, let him also be despised by you.'" Accordingly, when they came to the synod, they found Augustine sitting proudly in his chair of state, ready to dictate to them the changes they were to make in their customs in order that they might enter the universal church and join him in preaching "the word of God to the English nation." The Kelts were angered at this summary treatment, and answered that "they would do none of those things, not receive him as their archbishop; for they alleged among themselves, that 'if he would not rise now up to us, how much more will he condemn us, as of no worth, if we shall begin to be under his subjection?'" As the result of their fine Christian spirit, we find the most illustrious names of this missionary period among the Kelts. Their beautiful life-histories were dear to the devout hearts of later times, as the luxurious growth of legendary story that sprang up about them proves. But the missions of the Keltic Church were neither of wide nor of lasting success. They were not adapted to the times. Wherever a Kelt brought about a lasting conversion of a Teutonic people, or wherever a Keltic mission in Teutonic territory became permanent, it was through connexion with the Roman ecclesiastical organization. The Roman missionaries, on the other hand,

were successful from the beginning. Indeed, theirs was no smooth road either, and they often had to wait a long time; but, in the end, they always won. The times were with Rome.

It will be in order at this time to mention some of the leading missionaries of our period. At the beginning of the sixth century we meet with the first, and perhaps most illustrious, of this line of great men. This was Columba, an Irish prince, who left his native land to establish the monastery of Iona on the coast of Scotland (563). This was regarded as a step toward the conversion of the Picts, which was accomplished later by Columba and his followers. The founding of Iona was, however, of far greater importance for the future history of Europe than this, its original purpose, implied. Iona became a great missionary institute, whence came many workers of subsequent fame, not only for Pictish fields, but also for the lands of the Angles and the Saxons, and even for the continental Teutons. A second Keltic missionary of outstanding importance was Columbanus, who worked among the pagans in the region of Switzerland about 600. He remained true to the Keltic traditions, and came into several conflicts with the Roman Church. Augustine, the pioneer who brought Roman Christianity into Anglo-Saxon Britain, landed in Kent in 597, bearing the commission of the Great Gregory. He became the first Archbishop of Canterbury. Paulinus, another Roman missionary, accomplished the conversion of the Northumbrian king Edwin in 627. He was the founder of the episcopal see of York. Aidan and Cuthbert were two successful Keltic laborers in Northumbria. Mellitus, one of the assistants whom Pope Gregory had sent to Augustine, going under the shadow of the Kentish king Aethelbert's authority, planted a rather short-lived mission in London. To the Northumbrian Cedd belongs the credit of the final conversion of Essex. Birinus, a continental missionary (d. 650), was responsible for the winning of the West Saxons. A brother of the afore-mentioned Cedd, Ceadda or St. Chad, as he came to be known, a man of singularly beautiful Christian character,

did a valuable intensive missionary work while Bishop of Mercia. Wilfrid of York, for some time bishop of that see, later was a pioneer worker among the South Saxons and among the Frieslanders of the Continent. Other noted apostles to Friesland were Eligius and Willibrord. The former was a man of noble rank, a favorite of the Frankish court, and of wide fame as a goldsmith, which was then one of the few honorable crafts in that country. Willibrord was a Northumbrian, of the school of Wilfrid. Besides these names, there are two others, whose work, though it falls beyond our time limit, nevertheless is but a continuation of the labors of those already mentioned. The first of these is Winfrid, better known as Boniface, who brought about the conversion of a large part of Germany in the eighth century; the other is Ansgar, the apostle to Norway and Sweden, who labored in the ninth century. All these men were great and beautiful characters, and Europe owes much to them. They were the apostles to Teutonic Europe, and deserve a place beside the Twelve who went out in the first century to win a heathen world for Christ.

A previous paragraph has tried to tell about the missionary motives of the ancient workers: now we shall consider those of the apostles of the Middle Ages. Missionary work is never prevailingly selfish, but always largely a labor of love. It is, as far as can be, the opposite of the inglorious way of traders, whose habit is to exploit a new country for the benefit of their own pocket-books. Yet, we must say that the missionary motives of the mediaeval period were not quite as pure and Christlike as those that fired the disciples of the first century. It cannot be denied that, in addition to whatever humanitarian ideas possessed the minds of the popes, they also had a vision of the political importance they would gain if they could bring over the barbarian conquerors of Europe into their fold. The bishops of Rome in those days were men of large vision, and they realized that their see was in the ascendancy, with untold promise before it, should they play their cards well. This

hope of widening the influence and authority of their Church could not help but affect also the missionaries who went out directly at the wish of the popes. They went out with a feeling their their fight was to be one for their Church as well as for Christ. Perhaps it was often the consciousness that they were the pioneer representatives of a mighty institution behind them that gave to these missionaries the strength and endurance that they displayed. This can also, to some extent, be said of the missionaries that came from the Keltic Church. It was not so much the organization there, yet the spirit of the body of Christians whom they left at home must often have urged them on when their own wearied spirits would have rebelled. Another motive which gave rise to missionary work was the fact that it provided a way for meritorious living. All monasticism was the result of the efforts of individuals to gain merit in the sight of God. Here was a new way to serve the Master, one that provided abundance of privation and hardship, that enabled them to spend all their thoughts upon things divine, and that, at the same time, demanded the humility and love that the Master was so insistent in demanding. Consequently there was an eagerness among the monks to enter the mission field. Then the spirit of some monasteries was missionary in its nature. In some, as in the case of Iona, it became the tradition of the institution. We may trace this spirit to the founders of the particular institutions, or to some great members who had once lived there, who had individually heard the call springing out of their own piety and zeal. Here again we may say that idea begets idea, and life begets life: the influence of great missionary-minded men made other missionaries, and they others, and so on. Besides these influences there was also another, a very natural one. To a Christian, who conceives himself in possession of the one true, universal religion, it comes as a sort of a shock to learn that there are still people living outside of its grace and ignorantly following gods who are mere figments of the imagination, or at least beings incapable of working them any

good. This natural altruism has always been one of the main sources of the support given to missions by a well-established home church. In spite of all the fine, self-sacrificing work done by the mediæval missionaries, however, there was an air of artificiality about it that we cannot help but notice constantly and distinctly. There was not the old spontaneity about it which, by the very abundance of the life within, compelled men to go out in order to bring this life also to others. The missionary spirit here was as a carefully nurtured plant, grown in the artificial atmosphere and environment of the monasteries, where virtues alien to man's nature and to the clear sunlight of the open fields were being forced upon flesh and blood that rebelled. So even about the missions there is something strained and unreal. But the monasteries afforded the best that there was to be had: the rest was barbarism.

In Bede's *History* we read how Augustine and his followers, having landed at the Isle of Thanet, "sending to Ethelbert, signified that they had come from Rome, and brought a joyful message, which most undoubtedly assured to all that took advantage of it everlasting joys in heaven, and a kingdom that would never end, with the living and true God." This, in essence, was the message of the major portion of the mediæval missions. We may say that the fundamental message always brought, at least by the Roman missionaries, to the pagans, consisted of two parts. The first was that the Christian God was the only true God, and the Catholic Christian Church the only true church; and that all their own gods were false and their religious practices abomination. The second was that the Christian religion offered eternal salvation to all who were received into the Church. Besides these basic ideas, there were others which entered into the message. One was the politic one which assured success to the king who took up the Christian cause. This was used frequently. Here is an extract from a letter of Pope Gregory to Ethelbert: "Almighty God advances all good men to the government of nations, that He may by their means bestow the gifts of his mercy on those

over whom they are placed. This we know to have been done in the English nation, over whom your glory was therefore placed, that by means of the goods which were granted to you, heavenly benefits might also be conferred on the nation which is subject to you. Therefore, my illustrious son, do you carefully preserve the grace which you have received from the Divine goodness, and hasten to promote the Christian faith, . . . for He also will render the fame of your honor more glorious to posterity, whose honor you seek and maintain among the nations." Another element of the missionary message was the doctrine that the Christian sacraments were the sole means of grace. This idea, if dwelled on consistently for a long time, would be almost certain to make an impression upon the superstitious barbarians. In addition to these doctrines, the missionaries of course preached about some of the Christian virtues and truths, such as purity, humility, forbearance, forgiveness, etc. Many of these were distasteful to the average war- and sport-loving Teuton, yet the fact that the missionaries themselves offered constant living examples of them made its impression on some. There were some of the Christian traits and demands, however, which were sympathetic to Germanic character. To quote from Richard: "The idea of the infinite must have appealed to their mystical inclinations; their sense of personal worth must have been satisfied to learn that the Lord of the Universe took an interest in each individual. Christ and Christian saints, furthermore, permitted much more intimately personal relationship than the indefinite nature divinities of the German's imperfectly developed paganism." Wherever the missionaries went, they established monasteries, which became self-supporting centers of culture in their respective communities. These monasteries became the schools of the surrounding barbarians. Here they were taught the value of books and learning, the arts of building and agriculture, the art of healing, various trades, and many another of the processes that make for comfort and pleasure in life. Thus we may say that not the least

message the missionaries brought to the barbarian peoples was the message of civilization, illustrated in a practical manner. All through the mediæval mission work we notice a certain dictating attitude, an uncompromising "I am right, and you are wrong" spirit, which is practically absent in the ancient period. There was no respect for the inherited ideas of the pagans themselves. This, however, may have been for the best, as the men to be convinced had not yet reached the stage where the reason was a ruling influence in their lives. Moreover, the barbarians knew where these men who spoke with so much authority had come from; they knew about the great civilization of the south, which these men represented, and they had much respect for that civilization.

The influences which preceded the missionaries to a new country, creating a favorable disposition toward Christianity, were, perhaps, of greater importance than that of the missionaries themselves. If the Christian monks had come out of the unknown, and entirely unheralded, it is to be doubted whether they could have made any impression whatsoever. The barbarians were not eager for a new religious message. The first and greatest of these extra-missionary influences, as we have said at several places before, was the knowledge of great Rome itself. In his book *The Holy Roman Empire*, James Bryce tells how, although the western Empire had fallen, and its provinces were now in the hands of Teutonic barbarians, nevertheless these same barbarians could not forget its old splendor, and how, even in their minds, the idea never entered that this Empire was dead. It was only "weakened, delegated, suspended"; with many of the nations it was a cherished hope some day to restore it to its full magnificence, with themselves at the head. Moreover, the barbarians had always associated the Empire with Christianity. The two belonged together in their minds. The fact that other barbarian kings were taking up Christianity was a strong influence among those who were still pagan. These felt that the way to political power lay only in this direction, and they did

not care to be left behind in the race. Oftentimes there was a direct influence exercised over a nation by its overlord, who had become Christian. For example, the way was opened for Mellitus to establish his London mission because Ethelbert of Kent happened to be overlord of the East Saxons and their king Saebert. It was a comparative easy matter for Mellitus to win over Saebert; he found it more difficult to gain the king's sons or his thegns. The politics of the smaller kingdoms were in constant turmoil, and many were the lords and princes who had to spend part of their lives in exile. Often this exile meant presence at a Christian court. Oswald of Northumbria actually spent his youth in the monastery of Iona. No wonder he was zealous for Christianity when he had become king! Sigbert of East Anglia had been converted while an exile on the Continent. Then there were many political matrimonial alliances whose influence went in the same direction. Clovis, the first great Frankish prince, was converted to Christianity about 500. He had previously married the Burgundian princess Clotilda, who was an orthodox Christian. Before Augustine came to Kent, Ethelbert had married a Christian Frankish princess, whom he had allowed a bishop and a chapel in order to worship according to her faith. Edwin of Northumbria, who was afterwards persuaded by Paulinus, had married the Christian princess Aethelburh, a kinswoman of Aethelbert. When Peada, the son of Penda, the great pagan king of Mercia, applied to Oswiu, of Northumbria, for the hand of the latter's daughter, he was refused on account of his faith. So he offered to become a Christian, and was baptized and married in the same year.

It is interesting to note that, while ancient missions began with the people and worked up to the Emperor, mediaeval missions began with the kings, and after these had been won, worked with the people. Stubbs, in *How Europe was Won for Christianity*, states that "so long as Eadwine remained unconverted, the preaching of Paulinus would have little effect upon this pagan folk (Deira)." The same was true in almost all other

barbarian countries: the king was the key to the situation. Naturally, therefore, the missionaries began with the kings. The mission methods of the Middle Ages may be called ecclesiastical and monastic, as over against the personal and persuasive methods of the ancient propaganda. By the former, we mean that the pagans were made to feel the presence and power of the Church as an institution from the beginning. By the second, we are trying to designate the intensive methods to be described later on. Wherever they could accomplish it, the missionaries arranged so as to make their advent as impressive as possible. When Augustine was to meet Aethelbert, the king arranged that the meeting be held in the open air, fearing that the newcomers might be skilled in the magic arts. "But," says Bede, "they came furnished with Divine, not with magic virtue, bearing a silver cross for their banner, and the image of our Lord and Saviour painted on a board; and singing the litany, they offered up their prayers to the Lord for the eternal salvation both of themselves and of those to whom they were come." The missionaries were not slow at exacting promises if they found themselves in a position where this was possible. Bede relates how Paulinus found the then-exiled Edwin brooding over his misfortunes in the dead watches of the night, and brought him the promises of new hope. Said he, "But if one came to thee with the assurance of thy safety and a promise of thy return to thy father's kingdom and thine, what wouldst thou do for such a one?" "My gratitude should match his kindness," was the response. "And if he who promised these things should tell thee of a better way than any thy ancestors or kinsfolk ever heard of, wouldst thou follow his teachings?" "In very truth I would," the exiled prince replied. Paulinus, who was then an entire stranger to Edwin, raised his right hand and, placing it impressively upon Edwin's brow, he said, "When this sign shall be given thee, remember our discourse and delay not to fulfil thy promise." There came a time when the sign was given, and the noble Edwin could not refuse. The aid of the strong arm of military force was not despised. When

the young Amandus, later missionary to Friesland, returned from Rome to labor for the conversion of the pagan tribes on the Schelde, he met with little success. So he besought Dagobert, king of the Austrasians, to force upon these tribes the Christian faith. Naturally, the result of this move was not very desirable. The work of Willibrord in Friesland was made possible largely through the influence of Pepin, the father of Charles Martel, since that prince compelled the Frisians to receive the missionary peacefully and listen to his words. The popes were in the habit of sending personal letters and sometimes even presents to the kings whom their missionaries were trying to convert. Considering how the pope, as the head of the great Christian Church in the West, and the only visible head the Empire had at the time, was regarded by most western peoples, we may imagine what effect these things had upon the vanity of the obscure barbarian kings. Appeal to a man's vanity, or please him with presents, and access to him is made very much easier. The missionaries themselves employed presents as a means to their end. For instance, when, after a period of absence, Ansgar returned to his Swedish mission, he found that paganism had been revived with new vigor there, and that he was liable to be driven out again any moment. So he invited King Olaf to a grand dinner, and presented him with rich gifts, finally requesting him that he afford protection to him and his work. The protection was granted. In order to gain their ends, the missionaries worked much on the credulity of the people with whom they dealt. Says Richard, "Priests and bishops gained and held their influence over the people probably not so much as the representatives of a higher civilization or a more spiritual religion, but as the wielders of magical power." The story of Boniface and the Hessians is a case in point. The following narrative is from Sheldon: "Finding that it was difficult to win the people of that region from their idolatrous veneration of an enormous oak tree which was esteemed sacred to Thor, Boniface decided to lay the axe to the tree. The awe-struck heathen stood around, expecting that their deity would

take vengeance upon the authors of the sacrilege. They only saw the tree come crushing down, and riven into four pieces. Of these Boniface constructed an oratorium and dedicated it in honor of St. Peter. Impressed by such a palpable indication of the impotence of their gods, many of the heathen turned to the Christian faith."

Of course, such methods as this had very little Christianity in them. Yet we must not forget that the missions of the Middle Ages also had a sound Christian element in them. Otherwise the work could not have lasted. Questionable methods were used for the most part only in order to gain an entrance into the fields. The missionaries, after all, were fine personalities, and their time was spent, by far the bigger portion of it, in painstaking and self-sacrificing personal work. They were constantly preaching to all classes, and they got many of them to think. The story of St. Chad, the bishop of Mercia, is a beautiful one, and the influence he exerted over the lives of the people can be imagined. A noble, holy figure he made, yet he was not content to sit in his episcopal chair, but spent much of his time making long journeys on foot, preaching the gospel "in towns, the open country, cottages, villages, and castles," winning the devotion of all classes of people. We might find many whose lives were a round of service like that. But the missionaries were not content with preaching. They helped their people in all ways they could. When Wilfrid came to the South Saxons a second time, he found them suffering from a famine. So he taught them to weave together their small eel-nets and to venture out with these into the rivers and bays where a plentiful supply of food was to be found. The newly established monasteries, too, were ever ready to help in time of need. The greatest missionary work of the monasteries, however,—and this is where what we called the monastic method of missions comes in—was to train young men of the neighborhood in a Christian education, thus preparing them for work among their own people. This may be called the origin of the educational policy in missions, so generally adopted in

the foreign work of today. It was the men thus prepared who made the conversion of the Teuton tribes a permanent achievement.

The mediæval missionaries often had to work a long time without any visible results at all. That was because the time was not favorable, and no good opportunity had offered itself. Once they could get external circumstances in their favor, the converts were gained quickly and in great numbers. Augustine was not in Kent a long time before he had established a good-sized church there. So at many places. When the Frankish Clovis was baptized in 496, 3,000 Franks went to the font with him. In our period, there frequently was manifested a similar devotion to the king or chief. And how about the kings? They likewise were, in many cases, impelled by state reasons. What Richard says of Clovis was true of many others: "The king found it to his advantage to be baptized, not only because he had vowed to become converted in case the Lord gave him the victory over the Alemans, but for important reasons of state." Ethelbert of Kent felt that by his conversion he could come into closer alliance with the continent. At the time of the struggle between the Mercian Penda and the Christian alliance under the Northumbrian kings, Christianity was made a principal issue of the conflict, and this must have influenced many. It is significant that the king of the West Saxons, the people who were to become the future overlords of Britain, was converted about this time. Similarly, the Norwegian prince Harald was converted to Christianity while living in the hope that the Franks would aid him in recovering his kingdom. The political nature of these conversions is shown by the ease with which they would relapse into paganism if circumstances happened to alter. After the death of Ethelbert, there was such a return even in Kent itself. For a time, as we have seen, Essex was entirely lost to the Christians, Mellitus having to flee for his life. Sometimes the hold depended altogether on the presence of the missionary. Wilfrid spent a fairly successful winter in Friesland, but, being compelled to

continue his journey in the spring, "the immediate results of his labors were soon swallowed up in the surrounding paganism." Those countries whose isolation or spirit of independence put them out of reach of the Roman influence were all but impervious to Christianity. It was this cause that made the struggle to gain Friesland so long and hard. To quote from Stubbs: "From their first appearance in history their record is one of struggle against mightier powers to retain ancestral independence. It is not surprising, therefore, to find them for many years resisting all efforts of the missionaries sent among them to win them to the Christian faith, and clinging tenaciously to the worship of gods in whose name their ancient heroes had fought and conquered. A new religion and new customs threatened the very foundations of the old free life, and priests and leaders and people set themselves like flint against the introduction of the Christian Church." They were not politically ambitious, like so many others of the Teutons of the period, and therefore had no use for Christianity. They were finally compelled to submit under the pressure of the strong hand of the Frank. Denmark was another such country. The great Willibrord, who had been successful in Friesland, where he had had the protection of the Franks, penetrated into this field, but he found it unpromising, and could make no other gain than the opportunity to educate some youths whom he purchased from slavery. Even at the late period in which Ansgar worked, the impression he could make in Norway in the course of a long period of work there was practically nothing. Thus we see that the remarkable success that greeted the missionaries of the Middle Ages was due, for the most part, to the political situation.

The depth of religious insight that all the copious preaching of the missionaries produced in the barbarian converts is gauged by a few incidents. When Edwin was considering whether he should turn over to the new faith, he called a council in order to determine how his people would look at the change. In this council one of the elders, who seemed to voice the sentiments

of those gathered, said: "The present life of man, O king, seems to me, in comparison of that time which is unknown to us, like to the swift flight of a sparrow through the room wherein you sit at supper in winter, with your commanders and ministers, and a good fire in the midst, whilst the storms of rain and snow prevail abroad; the sparrow, I say, flying in at one door, and immediately out at another, whilst he is within, is safe from the wintry storm; but after a short space of fair weather, he immediately vanishes from your sight, into the dark winter from which he had emerged. So this life of man appears for a short space, but of what went before, or what is to follow, we are utterly ignorant. If, therefore, this new doctrine contains something more certain, it seems justly to deserve to be followed." At the Synod of Whitby, which was called in order to settle the differences between the Keltic and the Roman representatives, long arguments had been made and strong claims presented by either party, when the bishop Theodore finally, in a fit of impatience, replied to his opponent that the Roman claim was upheld by Peter himself, who was entrusted with the keys of heaven. The presiding officer, Oswy, the influential king of Northumbria at the time, raised his head in new interest at this remark. "If that is the case," he said, "why need we argue any further? I, for my part, would not be willing to do anything that might bring displeasure to the one who holds the keys to our future abode of happiness." With this remark, the question was settled. Again, we read the following in Bede: "In the third year of the reign of Alfrid, Caedwalla, king of the West Saxons, having most honorably governed his nation two years, quitted his crown for the sake of our Lord and his everlasting kingdom, and went to Rome, being desirous to obtain the peculiar honor of being baptized in the church of the blessed apostles, for he had learned that in baptism alone, the entrance into heaven is opened to mankind." How childish these conceptions when compared with the depth of understanding and the profound change of life that Christianity effected among the converts of the first century!

The result of mediæval missions is already foreshadowed in the policy that was adopted in the work. Not that the result could have been any different, for we have already seen, in our survey of the field, that the people could not have received Christianity in the purity of its essence. But to consider the policy: a characteristic pointer is found in one of Gregory's letters to the English Mission under Augustine. "I have," he says, "upon mature deliberation upon the affair of the English, determined that the temples of the idols in that nation ought not to be destroyed; but let the idols that are in them be destroyed; let holy water be made and sprinkled in the said temples, let altars be erected, and relics placed. For if those temples are well-built, it is requisite that they be converted from the worship of devils to the service of the true God; that the nation, seeing that their temples are not destroyed, may remove error from their hearts, and knowing and adoring the true God, may the more familiarly resort to the places to which they have been accustomed. And because they have been used to slaughter many oxen in the sacrifices to devils, some solemnity must be exchanged for them on this account, as that on the day of the dedication, or the nativities of the holy martyrs, whose relics are there deposited, they may build themselves huts of the boughs of trees, about those churches which have been turned to that use from temples, and celebrate the solemnity with religious feasting, and no more offer beasts to the Devil, but kill cattle to the praise of God in their eating, and return thanks to the Giver of all things for their sustenance; to the end that, whilst some gratifications are outwardly permitted them, they may the more easily consent to the inward consolations of the grace of God." Compare this to the uncompromising hostility that the ancient Christians maintained toward all customs and implications that put them in danger of coming under the power again of the old daemons. But the Teuton converts never knew that freedom from the daemons was a thing to be desired. Chambers, in his *Mediæval Stage*, devotes a great deal of space to show how little the adoption of Christianity affected the real

customs and beliefs of the people, how usually the change was not much more than a change of name. Thus there are a great many folk-customs and folk-beliefs at this day which have their origin in pre-Christian times. Richard gives his testimony to the same effect: "Slowly, under the influence of German priests, the Christian saints took the places of the heathen gods. The sign of the cross, baptism, and other Christian rites were readily accepted as so many new spells." Christianity did not transform the superstition of the Teutonic barbarians into an intelligent, ethical religion, but only transferred that superstition to other forms, and even not that entirely, for there have continued to exist strong underecurrents of magic and witch-craft among those people down to this very day. But, if such was the effect upon the mass of the converts, Christianity nevertheless brought with it the hope of a new era, for it was the carrier of an old culture which could not fail but work in the minds and characters of the new peoples, as time went on, and, moreover, it brought with it schools in which were to be nurtured the world's future leaders. Altogether, the conversion of Teutonic Europe to Christianity was a step in advance, but it was so by virtue of its final results and not by its immediate effect.

We have seen how the ancient field comprised a large and peaceful Empire, which was the scene of a decadent culture. We have seen how men had grown world-weary, and were searching vainly in all directions to find salvation, or at least something that would give life a new zest. We have considered the mediæval field, how it was constituted of a multitude of barbarian peoples, just waking up to the external possibilities of life, and still full of original vigor and naturalness. Then we took up the Christianity of the first and second centuries, and found it a strong, vital force of the spirit, still close to the personality of its founder, and dependent for its propagation upon nothing but its own inner power. Mediæval Christianity, we found, was a well-established institution, in which organization, doctrine, and ritual had become the chief interests, but

which recommended itself to the new nations because of its immense prestige. After these preliminary investigations, we proceeded to a study of the missions themselves. The ancient missionaries we found men of various origin, with no official ordination nor a central authority sending them into the field, but urged forth by the zeal of the inner life within them to effect a similar life in others. The message of these missionaries was of singular simplicity and yet of such profound completeness that it was equal to satisfy every demand the intelligence or the conscience could make upon it. The method by which this message was proclaimed was through persuading the individual reason and through personal contact, with the influence that such contact implied. The missionary work, however, was not all done by the missionaries, but was greatly aided by many influences, chief among which was the example of the newly formed Church itself. The message was apprehended thoroughly, bringing about a complete change in the lives of those who accepted it, which converts at first came largely from the lower and middle classes, but which later came also from the highest classes, until finally the Emperor himself was reached. Taking up mediæval missions in their turn, we found that the missionaries came almost exclusively from the monasteries, and that many of them were sent out directly by the powerful church organization. We have seen that the message they presented was very superficial, and that, in itself, it did not make a very strong appeal to the persons to whom it was addressed, but that the success of the missionaries was due largely to the prominence their Church had gained in the political affairs of Europe. The method of work employed by the missionaries may be styled the ecclesiastical, which made men feel the power of the Church, and monastical, which planted monasteries in the midst of barbarian communities, to teach them civilization, but especially to train some of their own young men for later church work in those fields. The approach was usually made through the king of a country, whom the people then could easily be induced to follow, and this approach was accomplished usually by

making him appreciate the political advantages that would ensue upon his conversion. The spiritual apprehension was but meager, but, we may believe, as great as the convert's cultural advancement allowed. The immediate result of the mission was to leave the new nations in much the same superstition they had been in before, though with a change in form. The more remote result was to open the way for the new nations to develop into civilization, and to plant the seeds for even a higher advancement than had been reached in the best ancient period.

Which then were the better: the missions of the ancient age, or those of the mediæval age? Ancient missions would have been impossible in the Middle Ages; mediæval missions would have been foolish and equally unsuccessful in ancient times. In both we find elements that are of use in our foreign mission work of today; in both, also, there are elements which we could not use. So our conclusion is this: both ancient and mediæval missions were good, because each one was best adapted to its own work.

MILL CREEK, ILL.

III.

EUGENICS.

CHARLES P. STAHR.

The science of eugenics has a direct bearing and influence upon our social life; the better its principles are understood by those interested in social uplift, the more reasonable will the application of those principles to social problems be, and if the hopes and dreams of the eugenist are ever realized, no one can estimate the economic value of this eugenic movement.

The object of this paper is "to enlighten, not to frighten," using the words so often displayed in the campaign for improved infant hygiene; and if, in this paper as in these campaigns, the illustrations used are at times, to say the least, unpleasant, we hope that the truth of the statement "that sometimes it is necessary to frighten in order to enlighten" will be a sufficient defense and apology for the writer.

We wish it understood at the outset that we do not pose as an authority on eugenics. We wish to give you the results of our reading and study, and in so doing it is our aim, as far as possible, to remain neutral. The argument of the eugenist will be presented, his aim, his object, and the need for the application of the principles of eugenics to our social life; and at the same time, the writer will endeavor to present what, to his mind, are the strongest reasons for the doubt existing in the minds of many authorities today, concerning the practicability of the teachings, or the wisdom of the attempt to apply to our modern life the conclusions of this new science.

The literature of eugenics is large. Our popular magazines are full of articles, for and against the subject, the scope and depth of which will suit every taste, ranging from "Mr. Dooley on Eugenics" in a late number of *Hearst's Magazine*,

to articles which tax the understanding of the scientist and biologist. We are not ready to agree with Dr. James H. Walsh, when, in a recent lecture, he characterized eugenics as a "fad," and asserted that "the doctrine of heredity is a silly superstition." At the same time the most rabid eugenist is ready to admit that the science of eugenics is yet in its infancy, and has progressed very little beyond the stage of investigation. Let us therefore investigate with a fair mind.

The word "eugenics" is derived from two Greek words, and literally means "*well-born*." Eugenics has been defined as "the science of being well-born," or in the words of Sir Francis Galton, commonly accepted as the founder of this new science, "Eugenics is the study of the agencies under social control, that may improve or impair the racial qualities of future generations, either physically or mentally," or "the science which deals with all influences that improve the inborn qualities of a race." The word "*inborn*" in the latter definition is the thorn in the flesh of those opposed to the principles and methods of the eugenist, for surely no one could find fault with the *study* of all agencies concerned, nor dispute the value of such a study, nor deny the possibility of some rational, practical application of some, at least, of the results of that study to our modern social life.

Mr. Charles Benedict Davenport defines eugenics as the "science of the improvement of the human race by better breeding." He says "the eugenical standpoint is that of the agriculturist, who, while recognizing the value of culture, believes that permanent advance is to be made only by securing the best blood." "Man is an organism,—an animal,—and the laws of improvement of corn and of race horses hold true for him also." Just here Mr. Davenport has exposed himself to bitter attack, but of this, later on.

We have called eugenics a new science. In reality, it is an old one. The idea of definitely undertaking the improvement of the innate characteristics of the human race has been expressed repeatedly through centuries, seriously, hopefully, but

perhaps not until now scientifically. As Prof. Wm. E. Kelliott, of Goucher College, says, "we can trace the idea, perhaps better the hope, of eugenics back to Plato." Plato in his "Republic," pointed out that the quality of a herd or flock could be maintained only by breeding from the best, and by the destruction of the weaklings. He drew attention to the necessity in the state for a functionary corresponding to the shepherd to weed out the undesirables, and to prevent them from multiplying their kind. Plato also stated clearly the essential idea of the inheritance of individual qualities, and the danger to the state of a large and increasing body of degenerates and defectives.

The present eugenic movement may be said to date from 1865, when Sir Francis Galton showed that mental qualities are inherited just as are physical qualities, and pointed out that this opened a way to an improvement of the race in all respects.

He published in 1869 his "Hereditary Genius," presenting in this work facts in support of the above claim. In 1883, he published his "Inquiries into the Human Faculty," and the word "eugenics" was then coined. These publications, however, failed to arouse any general interest in the subjects presented.

In 1901, in his Huxley lecture of that year, he returned to his theme, and in a more direct and elaborate way. His lecture was upon "The Possible Improvement of the Human Breed under the Existing Conditions of Law and Sentiment." This time Galton received a real hearing. He proceeded to show that we have a sufficient biological knowledge of man to furnish a working basis. He showed that we possess a knowledge of man's variability and heredity, that some men are worth more than others in a community, and that individual traits are also family possessions, and followed this up with definite suggestions as to possible means of the "augmentation of favored stock."

In 1904 and 1905, Galton delivered addresses before the

Sociological Society of London. His first address was upon "Eugenics, its Definition, Scope and Aims." This was a statement of the elementary principles of the subject, a sort of eugenic creed. A few of Galton's enthusiastic supporters brought forth on the spur of the moment, wonderful visionary schemes for eugenic progress, which all died a natural death, and much of the adverse criticism of Galton went wide of the mark. But Galton did start the scientists and biologists to thinking, and in the years that have passed, an immense amount of knowledge has been gained, and excellent workers have been recruited. A periodical, *The Eugenics Review*, has been established and appears regularly. A Eugenics Education Society has been founded to popularize and disseminate information.

While England remains the seat of the greatest activity and interest in the eugenic movement, much is being done now in our own country. In America, the subject is largely under the auspices of the American Breeders Association, through its efficient Committee on Eugenics, with which a large number of biological and medical workers are coöperating. A Eugenics Record Office has been established at Cold Spring Harbor, which is busily engaged in gathering data from all over our country, eugenic ideals are being given practical expression, and the science is rapidly gaining headway.

A few words concerning the work and the aim of this Eugenics Record Office. This office wishes to get in touch with all those interested in the eugenics movement. Every person who is willing to do so is invited to record his heritage, and place the record on file at the Record Office. All you need to do is to drop a card to the Eugenics Record Office, Cold Spring Harbor, New York, and the blank schedule will be gladly furnished. Of course, these records are held as confidential, and are to be used only for scientific purposes. A mass of really valuable information can be secured in this way; surely no harm is done, and the inheritances of many traits can be traced in this way, and scientific investigation be stimulated.

The office asks especially for pedigrees in which one or more of the following traits appear, short stature, tallness, corpulence, special talents in music, art, literature, mechanics, invention, mathematics, and certain diseases, rheumatism, eye defects, peculiarities of hair, skin, etc., cancer, hemophilia (bleeders), deformities, such as hare lip, cleft palate, and so on through a long list. They do not appeal primarily to physicians for the information, but "to the thousands of intelligent Americans, who love the truth, and want to see its interests advanced," quoting from "*Heredity and its Relation to Eugenics*," by Davenport. Statistics gathered in some such way are of value as we hope to show later on in this paper.

The blanks furnished by the Record Office, if properly filled out, furnish a complete family history, space being given to the father of the family, mother of the family, father's father and mother, mother's father and mother, with space for the children of the family. Information is asked, concerning birthplace, residence, occupations at various ages, lesser diseases to which there was special liability, in youth and in middle age, grave illnesses in youth and middle age, operations undergone, and if dead, cause of death and age at death. Then a statistical table to be filled out for the various individuals before mentioned, consisting in part of height, weight, color of hair, of eyes, general mental ability, special ability, as for instance, in music, art, literature, mechanics, etc., and then bodily defects, and defects in the special senses. Enough we grant you to weary the average individual before the blank is half completed and much, to our mind, of no practical value.

Now, what is this all about? What does the eugenist hope to accomplish, and is there any need for his effort? The latter part of this question is easily answered. No social order is so perfect that it cannot afford carefully to consider plans for its improvement, but we postpone the consideration of this part of the general subject of eugenics until later. We cannot better state the aim of the eugenist than by quoting again from Mr. Davenport. He says "The general program of the eu-

genist is clear. It is to improve the race by inducing young people to make a more reasonable selection of marriage mates, to fall in love *intelligently*," which, to quote the thought at least, if not the words of Mr. Dooley, is *some job*. It also includes the control by the state of the propagation of the mentally incompetent, wherein, to our mind, the eugenist strikes solid rock, and meets with universal accord.

Inseparably connected with the science of eugenics is heredity; one of the prime objects of this science being the study of the laws of inheritance of human traits, and as these laws are ascertained, to make them known, and it is the dream of the eugenist that when such laws are clearly formulated, many unfit matings will be avoided, and other matings that might have been shunned through ignorance, may be happily contracted.

No presentation of the subject of eugenics would be complete without some consideration of the general subject of heredity. The writer realizes the difficulty which confronts him in his attempt to consider this portion of his subject. He will endeavor to be clear, direct and brief, avoiding as far as possible, technical and scientific terms.

Before we go into the subject of heredity in detail, let us consider what Mr. Herbert E. Walter in his most interesting book on "Genetics," an introduction to the study of "Heredity," calls "the triangle of life." He forms a triangle with the base line representing *heritage*, one side he calls *environment*, the other, *training*. In the center within a circle, he has the words, "what we," and an arrow pointing toward the base or heritage, ending at the word, *are*, another toward environment, ending in *have*, and another toward *training*, ending in *do*. In other words, heritage represents what we are, environment, what we have, and training, what we do, with our heritage and environment.

Certainly, these three, *heritage*, *environment* and *training*, are factors determining the characteristics of any individual. No one factor can be omitted, but the eugenist places the em-

phasis upon heritage. This is to him, the factor of greatest importance. Is he right or is he wrong? To our mind, he is partly right and partly wrong. Heritage or blood expresses the inborn equipment of the individual. It is what he is actually given before birth. "It is his nature," quoting from Mr. Walter. It is what determines whether he shall be a beast or a man. But does it, to the extent the eugenist would have us believe, determine *what sort* of a man he is going to be?

Now, what is heredity? In the words of Professor Castle, in his "Heredity in Relation to Evolution and Animal Breeding," "it is organic resemblance based on descent." It is commonly said a son is like his father, because he is a "chip off the old block." As Mr. Walter says, it would be nearer the truth to say that the son is like his father, because "they are both chips from the same block."

The *Century Dictionary* defines heredity as "the influence of parents upon offspring, the transmission of qualities or characteristics, mental or physical from parents to offspring." Another definition is "by heredity is meant the tendency manifested by an organism to develop in the likeness of its progenitor."

Our knowledge of heredity and the laws governing it has increased wonderfully. The nineteenth century has been called "Darwin's Century." From the *Origin of Species*, in this, the twentieth century, biologists are turning to the origin of the individual and the study of heredity. Our knowledge even today, however, is very incomplete, and the study of this subject is yet in its infancy. It must be remembered at the outset that facts so far discovered have been the result of work done on plants and the lower animals. The eugenist claims that as man is an animal, the laws of heredity as found to apply to animals must apply to him also. This is true up to a certain point, but only up to a certain point, as we hope to make clear in due time.

A great deal of the inspiration for the work done in the study of heredity came from the work of an Austrian monk,

Mendel, who was born in 1822, and published an account of his experiments in 1865, but it was not until nineteen years after his death, until the year 1900, that biologists came to appreciate what he had done. The term, Mendelism, is applied to the results of his experiments, which are today the foundation of the knowledge of the physiological process of heredity, which now is rapidly being extended by biologists in various directions. We will speak again of his work and of Mendel's Law.

To make the way clear, let us consider briefly a few fundamental facts in the reproduction of any organism, plant or animal, that you may better understand the physiological process concerned in heredity.

We now know that all living organisms, plant or animal, no matter how complex, can be resolved into minute, microscopic units, which are called *cells*. This is the cell theory, advanced by Schleiden and Schwann, and now universally accepted. These cells, whether plant or animal, present the same general characteristics. They consist of a mass of living matter, called protoplasm, surrounded by a cell wall, and containing, usually centrally placed, a portion of specialized protoplasm, to which the term nucleus is applied, which is in turn surrounded by a nuclear membrane.

The nucleus is the vital part of the cell; upon it, the life of the cell depends, and all the changes which the cell undergoes, begin in the nucleus. The nucleus consists of more than one kind of substance; two at least are recognized, which are named from their reaction to staining agents, as chromatin (colored material) and achromatin (non-colored material). In certain phases of cell life, the chromatin masses together and forms within the nucleus definite structures termed chromosomes. These chromosomes appear constant in number in all the various cells that make up an individual of any one species. The growth and development of an organism depends upon the growth, development and reproduction or cell division of the cells in the tissue of that organism.

It is generally acknowledged that the chromosomes, the structures formed in the nucleus already described, play an important part in the hereditary process, so that it is interesting to note the part played by these same structures in the sexual process almost universal among animals and plants.

The mechanism by means of which two cells unite to make one in sexual reproduction, fertilization, as it is called, is essentially the same in plants and in animals. Here we have to deal with two kinds of germ cells, the male and the female, the egg or ovum and the spermatozoon, which take part in producing a new organism. These two germ cells, although different in structure, are essentially cells, and have in their nucleus the number of chromosomes characteristic for the species of organism under examination. With the union of the male and female cell, we would expect to have in the resulting cell twice the number of chromosomes. This is not the case, however, because these cells before becoming ripe for the process of fertilization undergo a process called maturation, in which half the number of chromosomes is thrown off by the nucleus, and extruded from the cell. Therefore, after union, we have again the original number, half supplied by the male, and half by the female element.

The mature germ cell, male or female, ready for fertilization with half its number of chromosomes is termed a gamete (marrying cell), while the fertilized cell, formed by the union of the two gametes, is termed a zygote (yoked cell), and contains the characteristic number of chromosomes.

By a process of repeated division, the zygote becomes a plant or an animal, whose cells apparently retain this double structure throughout. Certain cells of such a zygote become germ cells, and are set apart in certain tissues of the organism for the formation of gametes, undergoing as has been indicated, the reduction in the process of maturation. Let us here note that in this process of reduction, the chromosomes extruded from the cell may be those of paternal or maternal source, or a portion of both, a point to be remembered in the study of the

physiological method of heredity, offering some explanation of the observed inheritance of characters.

It is not within the scope of this paper to discuss at length different theories of heredity. We have indicated briefly the chromosome theory. Whether correct or not, we have in the union of the two gametes what Walter calls the "hereditary bridge." He says: "Whatever may ultimately prove to be determiners of the hereditary characters which appear in successive generations, it is obvious that in any event, such determiners must be located in the zygote, that is, the fertilized egg. This single cell is the actual bridge of continuity between any parental and filial generation." Moreover it is the *only* bridge.

The entire factor of heritage, therefore, is found in the two germ cells, derived from the respective parents, and as has been pointed out, in all probability in the nuclei and in the chromosomes of the nuclei. To the eugenist, therefore, a careful survey, a safeguarding of this hereditary bridge is of first importance, upon this depends the effectiveness of his campaign.

The application of the laws of heredity, that have been recognized as such, from studies in breeding plants and animals, to man, is at once a most difficult matter, difficult because our knowledge of these laws is so limited, and because the tracing of the hereditary transmission of traits, physical or mental, through generations of individuals, is a task that requires care, and the utmost caution in drawing conclusions. Herein lies one field of usefulness for the mass of data, which the Eugenics Record Office, already described, is striving to collect. The more accurate these data, and the wider their scope, the more valuable will be the conclusion drawn from their study.

We have spoken of Mendel, and his work in this field of investigation. Mendel chose the common pea as his subject for experiment. He studied the mode of inheritance of a single pair of characters at a time. On crossing a tall and a dwarf pea, he found that the hybrids, or first generation, were all

tall. Accordingly, he termed the tall character *dominant*, and the dwarf character *recessive*. On allowing these hybrids to fertilize themselves in the ordinary way, he obtained a further generation which on the average was composed of three talls to one dwarf. Subsequent experiment showed that the dwarfs always bred true, as did one out of every three talls; the two remaining talls behaved as the original hybrids in giving three talls to one dwarf. Experiments were made with several other pairs of characters, and the same mode of inheritance was shown to hold good throughout. Tallness and dwarfness here can properly be termed *unit characters*.

Mendel's law of dominance and Mendel's ratio have been observed by investigators, as holding true for the inheritance of many traits in generations of human beings. The essential part of Mendel's discoveries, it must be remembered, is that any gamete or germ cell ready for fertilization, can carry but one of a pair of unit characters, and must be pure for that character. This unit character is transmitted to the gamete by the zygote as it is set aside in the tissues of the organism.

Now let us consider two other terms, used in the study of heredity, variation and mutation. According to the *Century Dictionary*, variation is "the act, process or result of deviation from a given type of form of structure in a plastic vegetable or animal organization, by means of natural selection, or the sum of the phenomena resulting from the influence of conditions of environment, as opposed to those which would have been exhibited had the law of heredity alone been operative."

Some authors use the term variation, as implying a modification directly due to the physical conditions of life, and in this sense, variations are supposed not to be inherited. Were it not for the law of variation, the eugenist's idea of life would be hopeless indeed. It is a common experience with breeders of plants and animals to meet with constant difficulties in getting organisms to breed true. It is just these variations constantly interfering with breeding true, that furnish the only foothold for improvement. If all organisms did breed strictly

true, one generation could not, using again the words of Walter, stand on the shoulders of the preceding generation, and there would be no evolutionary advance. The breeder seeks to hold fast to whatever he has found to be good, and at the same time, tries to find something better. When the similarities and dissimilarities between succeeding generations therefore are clear, then heredity can be explained. This entire subject of variation from type is bound up with any consideration of the fundamentals of heredity.

There are many different kinds of variations enumerated in works upon heredity; they may be morphological, physiological, or psychological. Somatic or body variations arise as modifications due to environmental factors, germinal variations arise without regard to environment; they are deep-seated, racial rather than individual. Most important in our present connection, variations may differ with respect to heritability, they may possess the power to reappear in subsequent generations, or they may lack that power. Darwin said half a century ago, "our ignorance of the laws of variation is profound." This is true today. Let it be sufficient for us to say that Weismann believes that the causes of variation, at least of heritable variations, are inborn, intrinsic in the germ plasm.

By a mutation is understood a new quality, that appears abruptly without transitions, and which breeds true from the very first. To the student of heredity, there are two distinctions of prime importance with respect to mutations. First, they usually appear full-fledged, without preparatory stages, and second, that they breed true from the first appearance. *Fluctuations*, on the contrary, ordinarily "revert" to the parental type in subsequent generations.

Mutations are of three kinds, progressive, regressive, and degressive; *progressive*, the addition of a new character, *regressive*, the dropping out of something, and *degressive*, meaning the return of a character, formerly present in the past history of the race. We may offer as examples of mutations

among animals, the Ancon breed of sheep, sheep with short, bent legs, the Merino sheep, and the hornless Hereford cattle.

Whatever the causes of mutations may be, since they occur regardless of environment, they are probably of a germinal nature. The bearing of this whole matter of mutations upon heredity lies in the fact that it is apparently mutations that make up heritable variations and not fluctuations. If this is true, these mutations furnish the essential material in the study of heredity.

This discussion of heredity may seem far afield from the subject of eugenics, but some knowledge of the laws of heredity is necessary for a thoughtful consideration of our subject. Eugenics' worst enemies are the misguided, enthusiastic, but uninformed few, who are exploiting it, at the expense of those sincere and honest investigators, who brought the science into being. It really seems that those who have the most to say about eugenics, are those whose knowledge of it is the most superficial.

On the scientific basis of heredity, let us now consider the question of the inheritance of what are spoken of as *unit characters* and *acquired characters*. Like any other organism, man is a bundle of characteristics, physical and psychical. In their fully developed state, some of the traits or characteristics of organisms are single, simple, fundamental characters, not analyzable into more elementary factors. These so-called unit characters are analogous to the chemical elements, which may be combined and recombined in different ways, but which always maintain their integrity as elements.

Each unit character in the adult is the result of a series of reactions between the environing conditions of development and a structural unit in the germ cell which is called the *determiner*, which in some way that is not yet understood, represents this adult trait. The presence or absence therefore of a determiner in the germ cell is the primary cause of the corresponding presence or absence of a certain characteristic in the adult organism. Where both germ cells carry the determiner

for any unit character, the organism resulting from the union of those cells will have a double stimulus to the development of the given unit character. The eugenist then says the character is of duplex origin. Where on the other hand, one germ cell carries the determiner and the other lacks it, in the developing organism, the determiner is simplex and the resulting character is simplex in origin.

Just what may be regarded as human unit characters is a hard question to decide, and we will not attempt it. There are, however, many whose right to be called unit characters cannot be disputed, whose heredity has been traced and found to obey the general law of Mendel. Authorities are in accord, we think, in the belief that these unit characters are hereditary. Time will not permit us to go into detailed description of the heredity of many of these unit characters. Many of them are unimportant, even from a eugenic standpoint, except as corroborative evidence to prove the general proposition, such as eye color, hair form, hair or skin color, stature, total body weight, musical ability, ability in literary composition, mechanical skill, memory, temperament, etc. The inheritance of the above traits, or peculiarities, has been traced from the study of family records, and seems to obey some general law as follows. When both parents possess positive factors for any given trait, all of their children will exhibit the trait also; if both parents lack the factor, the offspring will lack the trait; when one parent possesses the factor, and the other lacks it, the children will vary much in respect to the trait in question.

When we come to consider general mental ability and its inheritance, we are confronted at once with the difficulty in recognizing a unit character. General mental ability, like stature and weight, undergoes a progressive development, so that in studying its heredity, we must compare it in adult persons, or else measure it by some such test as the Binet-Simon test. The eugenist claims, however, that there are laws of inheritance of general mental ability that can be sharply expressed; they say that low mentality is due to the absence of

some factor, and if this factor that determines normal development is lacking in both parents, it will be lacking in all of their offspring. "Two mentally defective parents will produce only mentally defective offspring." This is a law of inheritance of mental ability, that has been demonstrated beyond a shadow of doubt by the work of Dr. H. H. Goddard, superintendent of the Training School for Defectives at Vineland, N. J.

Dr. Goddard says in a paper on "Infant Mortality, in Relation to the Hereditary Effects of Mental Deficiency": "We now know that a surprisingly large percentage of people are of such low mentality, that they are incapable of living what we term a normal life. Another fact that we have learned is that these people of low intelligence transmit that low intelligence to their children, and that, consequently, a large percentage of these children, if they live and grow up, will be mentally deficient, will always be a burden on society, and more or less a burden to themselves."

Dr. Goddard further says: "Certainly in the light of all that we are beginning to know of eugenics, we cannot tolerate for a moment the thought of thus consciously and definitely going against all that eugenics teaches us, and aiding and abetting the establishment among us of a race of defectives, degenerates and weaklings." Strong words, surely, but made strong, because the truth which they express has been driven home to Dr. Goddard by wide experience. No one can accuse this authority of not knowing the subject to which he is devoted, the problem of the mentally deficient child. We venture the opinion here that if the science of eugenics does nothing more, it will be of enormous economic value in this, perhaps the most important branch of its activity.

As Davenport says: "In view of the certainty that all of the children of two feeble minded parents will be defective, how great is the folly, yes, the crime, of letting two such persons marry." Epilepsy and certain forms of insanity have been studied in much the same way, and their inheritance has been

found to follow the same general laws as that of feeble-mindedness.

When we consider the subjects of narcotics and criminality in general, we can find a strong hereditary tendency toward alcohol, and a hereditary tendency to crime, in not a few families in our country. To the writer the question comes whether in these cases, it is after all the heritage that is at fault, and not a faulty environment. Alcohol has been termed a racial poison, and we can readily see that the germ cells of an individual could be lowered in vitality by that poison, with the other cells in the tissues of the organism. Admitting then this hereditary predisposition, the individual possessing it would naturally be especially susceptible to the influence of bad environment.

The medical profession has been the subject of much severe and, to the writer, unjust criticism for what has been termed its reluctance to accept the theory of the hereditary transmission of disease. We resent the words of one critic, who says: "Modern medicine is responsible for the loss of appreciation of the power of heredity. It has had the attention too exclusively focussed on germs and conditions of life." On the other hand, we do not agree with Dr. J. J. Walsh, already quoted, who in a recent lecture at the University of Pennsylvania, said: "Not until physicians learn that disease and habit cannot be inherited; that tuberculosis and drunkenness are the results of environment, *pre-disposition* and suggestion, and that both are curable, can there be progress in medical science."

In our opinion, Dr. Walsh owes an explanation of the word, "pre-disposition," which he uses in the quotation referred to. He would find it hard, we think, to explain the difference between pre-disposition as he uses it, and the hereditary pre-disposition which we have tried to explain.

The medical profession has never doubted the influence of heredity in the development of certain diseases. One of the first things the medical student is taught is the importance of securing a careful family history, preparatory to his study of

any case. But scientific investigation has taught the physicians that many diseases long looked upon as hereditary are not such.

We, as a profession, are ready to admit and appreciate the part that heredity plays in many nervous diseases, Friedrich's disease, or hereditary ataxia, for instance; in hemophilia, the sufferers of which disease are commonly called bleeders; in syphilis, in a form of chorea, called Huntington's chorea, the essential feature of which is its appearance in successive generations.

In this connection, attention may be called to one of the most remarkable illustrations of hereditary transmission recently reported at a meeting of the College of Physicians and Surgeons in Philadelphia. A case of aniridia, or absence of the iris of the eye, was reported, which had been transmitted for four generations in the same family, involving 117 persons. The case was reported by a Dr. Risley, who said that in his opinion, the case was one of the most important illustrations of the transmission of anatomical characteristics he had ever seen.

The mode of the hereditary transmission of disease we do not know. We do not believe that the exciting cause of an infectious disease can be transmitted by the germ cell to the developing organism. The manifestations of congenital syphilis or syphilis of the new-born, are different from the lesions found in the adult.

Alcohol has been called a racial poison; so is syphilis. Whatever the mode of transmission of this disease, its results are distressing enough, and the honest efforts of the eugenist to check the ravages of this and other venereal diseases deserve the hearty support of all thoughtful people.

It is hardly within the scope of this paper to enter into a discussion of venereal diseases in general. With the exception of the one mentioned, they are not hereditary. They are, however, disgenic agencies of the greatest importance. They cannot be disregarded in a consideration of the subject of eugenics, because the broader the scope of eugenics, the more valuable will its application be to society in general.

One criticism we can offer to the work of the eugenist is that perhaps too much stress has been put upon heredity to the neglect of other eugenic agencies, which to the writer, at least, appear even more important.

We have mentioned "hereditary pre-disposition." Tuberculosis or consumption was long regarded as a hereditary disease.

It is no longer believed to be such. No one will deny, however, the importance of this "hereditary pre-disposition" in the consideration of the cause of this "white plague." Children born with this hereditary weakening of the germ cells, born into a tubercular environment, are practically doomed to fall victims to tuberculosis.

Here certainly environment is of more importance than heritage, but the call to the eugenist is just as strong in this field as elsewhere. His duty does not end when he does all in his power to prevent the marriage of persons in whom he may find this "hereditary tendency." Of far more practical value will his efforts be if they are directed toward correcting the defects and faults in the environment of children that may be born of this non-eugenic marriage.

In this connection, it might be of interest to note that work in line with this very suggestion is being done at many of our large stock farms. Cows, reacting to the tuberculin test, which formerly would have been destroyed, are kept for breeding purposes, isolated from the rest of the herd. The calves after birth are removed to a new environment, clean, airy stables, and although in certain instances, they are fed upon their mother's milk, sterilized by boiling, only a very small percentage of these calves ever react to tuberculosis, and grow up into perfectly healthy cattle, and a saving of considerable economic importance results from the application of this measure.

This system of breeding from tubercular cows was first applied by Dang of Denmark, and has been successfully tried at some of our own state experimental farms. Remember, please, that we are not advocating this method for general application to human beings, but surely the success of it in cattle offers us

some food for serious thought in our always present problem of lessening our high infant mortality.

We have spoken of the important part played by variation in heredity. The question now arises as to what kind of variations actually reappear in successive generations, and may, therefore, be considered hereditary. Can variations that are not inborn, but are acquired during the life time of any individual, be inherited? In other words, can acquired characters form a part of our inheritance? Can the experience of the parent, or can the environment of the parent, enter in any way into the heredity of the child? To make this possible, we can understand that changes wrought in the tissue of the organism will have to so act upon the germ cell that it in turn will give rise to tissues similarly modified in the next generation.

We must remember here that we are speaking strictly of biological inheritance, so that confusion may not arise in the views presented toward the close of this paper. The question "Can acquired characters be inherited?" is a most important one. It is most important to know whether one's own efforts can give one's children a better biological start in life.

Francis Galton was one of the first to express skepticism regarding what had been up to that time the generally accepted belief that the personal accumulations of a life time were heritable. August Weissman, for nearly fifty years a professor in the University of Freiburg in Baden, did more than any other to inspire thought and investigation upon this question. Weissman now has most of the authorities with him in the belief that acquired characters are not inherited. He claims that there is no known mechanism, whereby body characters may be transferred to the germ cells, that the evidence that such a transfer actually does occur is inconclusive and unsatisfactory, and lastly, that we have sufficient facts to account for heredity without the assumption of the inheritance of acquired characters.

Certainly from data furnished by experimental breeding in animals, the weight of probability is decidedly against the time

honored belief. We cannot go into a discussion of the question pro and con. Whether we believe that nurture as well as nature can be transmitted, the fact remains that between the two factors, there is no conflict. To our mind, it is not nature versus nurture, it is nature plus nurture. These two factors, hand in hand, work to form the individual. These make the man, and determine what kind of a man he is to be.

As has been hinted before, to our mind, the eugenist has perhaps laid too much emphasis upon nature, and has not paid enough attention to the influence of nurture. We do not mean to underestimate the importance of heritage. A faulty heritage, the inheritance of some physical or mental defect, will in the nature of the case do much to defeat all that we might hope from the influence of careful, tender, nurture, but we venture the assertion that in many, indeed, in most of the examples cited by the eugenist as typical of the influence of a bad heritage, we can trace side by side with this factor, the influence of lack of nurture, a bad environment.

The histories of two families are usually given by eugenists, as examples of good and bad inheritance. First, the Edwards family, drawn from Winship's account of the descendants of Jonathan Edwards. We quote as follows: "1,394 of his descendants were identified in 1900, of whom, 295 were college graduates; 13 presidents of our greatest colleges; 65 professors in colleges, besides many principals of other important educational institutions; 60 physicians, 100 and more clergymen, missionaries or theological professors; 75 were officers in the army and navy; 60 prominent authors and writers; 100 and more were lawyers, of whom one was our most eminent professor of law; 30 were judges, 80 held public office, of whom one was Vice-President of the United States; 3 were United States Senators; several were governors, members of Congress, framers of state constitutions, mayors of cities, and ministers to foreign courts; one was president of the Pacific Mail Steamship Company; 15 railroads, many banks, and other large industrial establishments have been indebted to their management. Almost

if not every department of social progress and of the public welfare has felt the impulse of this healthy and long-lived family. It is not known that any one of them was ever convicted of crime."

In contrast to such a family we have to offer the history of another well known family at the other pole of society. It is the history of the so-called "Jukes' Family of New York State," so carefully investigated by Dugdale.

This family is traced from the five daughters of a lazy and irresponsible fisherman born in 1720. In five generations, this family numbered about 1,200 persons, including nearly 200 who married into it. The histories of 540 of these are well known, and about 500 more are partly known. This family history was easier to follow than are some others, because there was very little marriage with the foreign born, a "distinctively American family." Of these 1,200 idle, ignorant, vicious, pauper, diseased, insane, feeble-minded and criminal specimens of humanity, about 300 died in infancy. Of the remaining 900, 310 were professional paupers in almshouses (at whose expense? we might ask), 440 were physically wrecked by disease, the result of their own wickedness; more than half of the women were prostitutes, 130 were convicted criminals; 60 were habitual thieves, 7 were murderers. Not one had even a common school education; only 20 learned a trade, and ten of these learned it in prison. It has been estimated that this family has cost the state over a million and a quarter dollars.

Mr. Kellicott says in his reference to this family: "What right had an intelligent and humane society to allow these poor unfortunates to be born into the kind of lives they had to lead, not by choice, but by the disadvantages of birth?"

Darwin wrote, long ago: "Except in the case of man himself, hardly any one is so ignorant as to allow his worst animals to breed."

The history of these two families presents a striking contrast. Here again the question naturally comes to our mind, how much is this contrast due to heredity, and how much to

environment, how much to nature, and how much to nurture? Consider, if you will, what would have become of an Edwards baby transferred soon after birth to the Jukes' environment, and what would have become of a Jukes' baby adopted by an Edwards' family in its early infancy. We will not attempt to answer this question for you; think, and answer it for yourselves.

We have been told that several members of the Jukes family did emigrate to the West, broke away from their evil environment, and became useful members of society. Unfortunately, we cannot offer you the proof of this statement, but we believe that it is correct and authentic.

Naturally the serious consideration of facts such as are contained in these family histories, leads us to ask, "What can we do about it?" Before we attempt to present the eugenist's answer to that question, let us consider a little more in detail the need for eugenics, or, if you will allow the writer to use the words, a broad, liberal, eugenic movement.

We as Americans are all too prone to feel with a false sense of self-satisfaction, that all is well with us, that things are as good as they can be made, so why should we worry over what cannot be helped. However, when we look at our almshouses, our institutions for the insane and feeble-minded, our jails, houses of correction and penitentiaries, we are not quite sure whether the above mentioned feeling is at all justified.

We again quote from Mr. Davenport. He says: "It is a reproach to our intelligence that we as a people, proud in other respects of our control of nature, should have to support 80,000 prisoners and 100,000 paupers at a cost of over 100 million dollars per year. A new plague that rendered four per cent. of our population, chiefly at the most productive age, not merely incompetent but a burden costing the above sum yearly, would instantly attract universal attention. But we have become so used to crime, disease and degeneracy, that we take them as necessary evils. That they were so in the world's ignorance is granted; that they must remain so is denied." Whether or not

the hereditary endowment of the civilized races of man is undergoing a gradual process of deterioration is a problem of the greatest importance.

Mr. S. J. Holmes, in an article on "The Decadence of Human Heredity," in the *Atlantic Monthly* for September last, calls attention to many forces in human society, which make for degeneration, and he says that in clear recognition of them lies our safety.

Speaking of the deleterious influence of modern warfare, for instance, he says: "The men of manly vigor, brains and courage go to the front to die by thousands in the cause of national defense. The weak, the cowardly, the mercenary, the degenerate remain behind to multiply." He dwells upon the greatly reduced influence of natural selection that has been brought about by the advance of medicine and surgery, and the knowledge of how to check and control many epidemics that formerly wrought havoc with the human race. We no longer have the elimination of the weak through tribal strife. We no longer leave the weak and imperfect infants to perish, but do all in our power to rear them, and then unfortunately give them full liberty to perpetuate their defects.

We again quote: "With sixteen exceptions, there are no states in the Union which forbid the marriage of the feeble-minded. In only fifteen states is there any prohibition upon the marriage of the insane. Only in Indiana and Washington is there any restriction placed upon the marriage of confirmed criminals." Through ignorance, indifference, false ideas concerning "personal liberty," and the absorption of legislators in matters of more immediate, *in their opinion*, expediency, we are permitting the accumulation of a vicious and defective heredity which should not be tolerated.

We have tried to show that mental and moral defects are heritable, and we know beyond a shadow of doubt that while individuals with a record of intellectual achievement are multiplying with relative and increasing slowness, the physically and mentally unfit reproduce more rapidly now than ever before in the history of races.

The superintendent of the Ohio Institution for the Feeble-Minded wrote only a few years ago: "Unless preventive measures against the progressive increase of the defective classes are adopted, such a calamity as the gradual eclipse, slow decay and final disintegration of our present form of society and government is not only possible, but probable."

We could quote opinions along similar lines from numerous men who speak from experience and with authority, but we do not wish to stand accused of being an alarmist. We do feel, however, that enough facts have been produced to show that the *call* for the work and aim of the eugenist is positive and strong enough to command our attention, while we briefly consider what Ellicott terms "*the eugenic program*."

We might well divide the work which the eugenist hopes to accomplish into two chief classes, first, *educational*, and, secondly, *legislative* or *compulsory*. First the eugenic program calls for the spread of the facts, through all classes of society. The aim is to bring forcibly before the people the facts of human heredity, to teach people to understand the force of the eugenic idea of good breeding. The eugenist hopes by education to produce first of all a thoughtfulness in the community, regarding the racial responsibilities of marriage and reproduction.

By placing before the people clear and truthful ideas regarding fit and unfit matings, he hopes to secure the ultimate effect, and more effective and permanent results will follow this plan than are likely to come from any amount of hasty and premature legislation. Just what effect such a campaign of education will have upon Cupid we do not know. Neither do we know just how much attention two young people thoroughly in love will pay to each other's family history or how thorough will the search for bad heritable qualities be conducted by the two interested parties when Cupid stands guard.

A very good friend asked the writer a few days ago, whether he was going to kick Cupid out of the window, or down the stairs, apropos, I suppose, of a recent picture in *Life*. Indeed,

he is not, but neither is he going to try to discuss for you the seeming conflict between the eugenic idea and love. In an article called "Eugenics and Common Sense" by H. Fielding Hall in the *Atlantic* for September, 1914, Mr. Hall says, "You see the eugenist omits love, he knows nothing about it or the world." This statement is probably about as unjust as some of his other criticisms of the eugenic idea. Mr. S. J. Holmes, before quoted, in an article entitled "Some Misconceptions of Eugenics," in the February *Atlantic* in a rather strong argument answers Mr. Hall's paper above mentioned, and while he mentions the above quotation, unfortunately, for us, offers no explanation.

It is, however, in the second class of activity comprising the legislative or compulsory measures that we find the most practical expression of the eugenic program. Under this head we comprise all measures which have as their object the limiting of the multiplication of the undesirable, dependent or dangerous elements of society.

From what has been said it follows that laws preventing the marriage and reproduction of those mentally defective and physically unfit are not only justifiable, but wise and necessary. Most of the eugenic laws which have been enacted and are in force in different states at present are aimed to prevent the marriage of those suffering from venereal disease and those who are feeble-minded. Laws against the marriage of the feeble-minded are unscientific because they attempt no definition of the class, and indeed there is a great difficulty here in securing competent persons to sit in judgment upon the applicants.

Laws preventing the marriage of those suffering from venereal disease are probably wise and for the most part, just. They entail a physician's examination, which naturally would be objected to, is often carelessly done, not always a sure safeguard and often a considerable expense to the parties interested or to the state. We do not care to discuss this phase of the question at length. We do venture to say, however, that a certain discrimination should be left to the examiners, which is always hard to secure when we have hard and fast laws.

As has been said in speaking of tuberculosis, in certain cases marriage under regulation and supervision might be fairer than absolute refusal to grant a license to wed. The State Board of Health of Wisconsin in its annual report shows that since the eugenics law went into effect January 1, 1914, the number of marriages dropped 3,800. The state board also says that many persons went into other states to be married rather than submit to the medical examination.

It might be interesting to note here that the Supreme Court of Wisconsin on June 17, 1914, sustained the constitutionality of the eugenics law, enacted by the legislature of the state, reversing in its decree the decision of a lower tribunal, which had declared the law invalid on the grounds that the required blood test for males was discriminatory.

We might discuss the laws in force in other states, but they are of the same general type, requiring certain things from the applicants for a marriage license, and present the same general defects and limitations that we have attempted to indicate.

We must, however, have laws not only controlling the marriage of the feeble-minded, using the term as indicating a broad class, but preventing their reproduction. Laws with this object in view can take two forms, a law permitting the sterilization of the class by a surgical operation, or laws requiring the segregation and proper isolation of the class according to sex.

The first form has not met with favor up to the present time. It has been applied chiefly to certain classes of the criminal and insane. The states of Indiana and Connecticut and Oregon, to our knowledge, have such laws in force at present.

The second form of law is a most commendable one. It entails a careful observation and study of the feeble-minded from childhood up. Our compulsory education laws bring every child to official notice, or can be made to do so. The child thus brought to notice should be examined as to his mental development. If he is normal, he will go on to the regular school, if merely backward, to a special school for backward children; if an idiot, an imbecile, his condition should be so recorded; if a

border line case, he must be watched, if he develops evidence of mental deficiency, that fact must be recorded. At the proper time, the parents must be informed of the state's willingness to take care of the child in a colony or suitable institution; if they are unwilling and not capable of seeing that he does not become a parent, the state must take him by force. Such a policy will cost money, but this will be compensated for by the reduction in the population of prisons, almshouses, asylums, etc.

This is the plan advocated by Dr. H. H. Goddard, who says: "We must detect all the mental defectives in childhood, keep a record of them and colonize them either at once, or upon the first intimation that their parents are not taking care of them, and that they are becoming nuisances. Because of the enormous hereditary factor in all of this problem, we must see to it that none of these people shall become parents. We may reasonably hope that such a policy carefully followed will in a generation or two largely reduce our feeble-minded population, and thereby our problems of pauperism, prostitution, disease, drunkenness and crime." A practical example of the effectiveness of some such idea of segregation is found in the work done with the cretins, who formerly abounded in Aosta in northern Italy. They were segregated in 1890, and by 1910 only a single cretin of sixty years and three demi-cretins remained in the community.

We have spoken of other eugenic agencies, which we feel should form part of a true eugenic program. To our mind, any factor which in any way can modify or improve the environment, the nurture of a child is a factor to be regarded as a eugenic factor. No less a eugenist than Luther Burbank says in a little book, entitled, *The Training of the Human Plant*, published in 1912: "All animal life is sensitive to environment, but of all living things, the child is the most sensitive. Surroundings act upon it as the outside world acts upon the plate of the camera. Every possible influence will leave its impress upon the child, and the traits which it inherited will be overcome to a certain extent, in many cases being more apparent

than heredity." He says again: "There is not a single desirable attribute which, lacking in a plant, may not be bred into it. Pick out any trait you want in your child, granted that he is a normal child, by surrounding him and giving him all that is implied in healthful environmental influences, and by doing all in love, you can thus cultivate in the child and fix there for all its life these traits."

He then presents a strong argument for the cultivation of abnormal children, transforming them into normal ones, and predicts great results for the good of the race from this practice. Is not this a hopeful view? Does it not open up a field of endeavor different, broader, and with a greater promise of successful results than any usually advanced for eugenics.

Measures for improvement of the environment, the early training, the physical and mental well-being of the child, are surely within the reach of all agencies, which have as their object social uplift. Under this head would come clubs for the training of "little mothers," our public schools as social centers, housing reforms, better child labor laws, and last but by no means least, societies to teach and to put into practice proper care of the prospective mother, whose surroundings are unfavorable. Our point is that these factors, not perhaps generally regarded as eugenic, as such, in the broad sense of the word, and a proper regard for them will in some degree at least overcome the defects of bad heritage.

And now what can be said against eugenics, against its teachings, its aims and the results when those aims are realized? We must remember at the outset that eugenics is admitted, by its strongest advocates, to be, at the present time in the state of investigation. No harm can possibly come from a most careful study of the laws of heredity of human characteristics. The applications of the results of such study to the mating of human individuals will be, if ever realized, a slow process. We dare not jump to conclusions. For the present, we are in accord with all honest efforts to prevent the multiplication of the physically and mentally unfit. In the meantime, while we offer

the eugenists all possible help in their investigations of human heredity, we cannot but feel that they are losing sight of the importance of the other two sides of the triangle of life, environment, and training. To our mind, environment is equally essential with heredity. We dare not consider and strive to improve the one at the expense of the other.

Breed a horse with all the speed you can secure in the pedigree of its parents, and the colt will never bring credit to that pedigree without a careful training on the track. The setter dog with its innate, inherited sense of scent, will never be a pleasure and a pride to its owner, a fit companion for his favorite pastime, the hunt, without careful training and a development of those qualities which it has acquired by heredity, which make it a hunting dog. Mere heredity never made a race horse or a bird dog. And as the eugenist argues that the laws of breeding for plants and animals hold true for man also, so we say that the reverse is true, that in man as in animals, environment is after all an equal factor with heredity.

We have said that the laws of inheritance, of evolution, of improvement of plants and animals hold true and apply to man, only up to a certain point. What this point is we will now try to determine. Prof. Herbert William Conn, professor of biology in Wesleyan University, in a book, *Social Heredity and Social Evolution, the Other Side of Eugenics*, makes a distinction between man as an animal, and man as a social unit.

While the laws of heredity which we have attempted to explain may hold good for animal man as it does for plants and the lower animals, there is no doubt that man as a social unit has developed under a new set of forces which have had little or no influence in the development of the animal kingdom. To this new set of forces, Conn applies the name "social heredity" in distinction from organic heredity, which we have been discussing. By the term social heredity, he means the power of handing on to the offspring the various accumulated possessions of the parents. These may be material, purely mental, customs, habits or even the methods of thinking of the last generation.

The fundamental differences between man and animals appear to be two in number. First, man alone possesses the power of forming concepts and using words, and second, man alone possesses a moral sense or conscience. We must remember that all the characteristics of social man, language, writing and printing, moral sense, customs, knowledge and accumulations are distinctly acquired characters. Man is not born possessing these distinguishing characteristics, and, like other acquired characters, they do not seem to be transmitted to the offspring.

But, nevertheless as Mr. Conn says, it is perfectly evident that these characteristics which constitute civilization are handed on from generation to generation. There is never any failure for one generation to receive them from its parents, and then they are transmitted just as truly as eye color, skin color, etc. Hence, the author's distinction between organic heredity and social heredity, or a heredity totally different from that which students of heredity have been studying. This kind of heredity has nothing to do with the mixture of the germinal substance; it is capable of being modified by the action of individuals, and is not controlled by the ordinarily accepted laws of heredity, and for this reason, has not received much attention in studies of eugenics.

But if we recognize this factor of social heredity how much more hopeful does the situation become. The pessimism, the hopelessness which so often follow a consideration of eugenics disappear, and a new spirit of cheerful endeavor takes its place created by the thought that we can do something to better the heritage of the next generation, using the word heritage, in its new broader sense.

And this idea of social heredity gives a sound basis for what we have termed broader eugenic agencies. We may hope for an advance in the race through all factors that help to improve the conditions of life of the present generation. Even though acquired characters may not be inherited in the usual acceptance of the term, they surely have some influence upon life, and as

we find that these acquired characters comprise nearly all that is most valuable in human nature, we cannot deny the power that social heredity plays in determining human evolution and progress. The essential feature of this social heredity lies in the ability of the individual to learn from his surroundings, and to teach his offspring what he has learned, it being really a re-learning, or a reacquiring by the young of those things that the parent is able to teach.

You may question whether the principle we have just considered can properly be called heredity. Certainly, it must not be confused with organic heredity, and we have tried to make the distinction clear. We speak of the child inheriting property from his parents, which of course, comes under the head of social heredity, and not organic heredity; so just as surely does he inherit language, customs, habits and other characters from his parents, and after all, what the child becomes he really owes to social heredity, though what he is when born, he owes to organic heredity.

Social heredity is just as sure in its action as organic heredity, and in fact to our mind, there are fewer factors of uncertainty in it. A child born and reared under a certain environment is sure to develop under the influence of that environment.

What we have indicated before, we may repeat here, that while organic heredity gives us certain powers, this factor, which Conn has called social heredity, determines what we shall do with those powers. And even though an individual have an inheritance weak both mentally and morally, he may be molded into a fairly good member of society, if he is surrounded by proper environment; but if, on the other hand, he is reared in the wrong environment, tending to produce a wrong social inheritance, he will not be a desirable member of society, no matter how good his mental and moral inheritance may have been.

Now the success of a marriage from the standpoint of eugenics is measured by the number of disease-resistant offspring, capable of development into useful manhood that come from it.

Therefore, the family with the greatest eugenic influence is the family with the largest number of such children, and in the narrow eugenic sense, those unions not blessed with children must see their influence upon evolution grow less and less.

Contrast this with what Mr. Conn says: "Through social heredity, a single individual, though leaving no offspring, may turn the direction of evolution and have more influence upon mankind than another with numerous progeny. Hence, while emphasis should be placed upon reproductive efficiency, even greater emphasis needs to be placed upon making the individual's life count, since the influence of the individual upon evolution through his life may be far greater than his influence through his offspring."

We know full well the untold happiness that comes to the family with the advent of children. But, after all, there is more to marriage than the raising of children. Love, companionship, mutual helpfulness, all that go to make man and wife the best of chums and comrades, we surely hope that eugenics will never detract in any way from these, and we do feel with Mr. Conn, that even though such a union be not blessed with offspring, it is in its power to make its influence felt in the progress of the human race.

LANCASTER, PA.

IV.

THE GOSPEL AND THE HEATHEN DEAD.

HIRAM KING.

It is the purpose of this paper to show that evangelization must needs be co-extensive with the race and that the Gospel is preached to the dead as well as to the living.

The fall of Adam is plainly implied in the Bible account of his transgression and consequent expulsion from Paradise, whether the account itself is an allegory or a historical narrative. The sacred record shows, moreover, not only that the disobedience of Adam would prove fatal to himself (Gen. 2: 17) but also that "in Adam all die" (1 Cor. 15: 22). As the descendants of Adam (the race) are thus involved in the fall without exceptions, it seems reasonable to infer that the provision of the Gospel was made for them in common.

The Offer of Deliverance is Due to all the Race.—The proposition is based on *justice* which is the principle of rectitude and therefore the standard of morals universally. The affirmation of the proposition, that all men are entitled to the offer of deliverance, implies (1) that the race are not accountable for the fallen condition in which they find themselves at consciousness and (2) that the ultimate responsibility for the fallen condition of the race belongs to the Creator Himself.

1. As men are brought into existence in *race-reproduction* and are thus necessarily precluded from *self-determination* in their origin, it follows that they are *non-moral* beings at the inception of life. They are, in fact, mere physical entities with mental and spiritual potentialities and become moral agents only with the evolution of the consciousness. To hold them accountable for their natural depravity when they thus become members of the race, not by their own *volition*, but by race-

reproduction, would manifestly be unjust and could not possibly be sanctioned in the realm of morals. Enlightened moral sentiment is here in full accord with moral philosophy. Men deprecate the moral tragedy of original sin but they do not attribute personal guilt to innate depravity.

2. Adam was *created*, but the race are *generated*. The distinction is marked and its recognition is essential to moral truth in this discussion.

God created Adam in His own intellectual, moral and spiritual likeness, endowing him thus with the highest mental and moral qualities. He also made him fully responsible for his moral conduct by thoroughly instructing him and accentuating, with the menace of death, His prohibition of the misuse of his moral agency (Gen. 2: 17). It is therefore plain that Adam was accountable for his personal fall and that the judgment pronounced on him was just (3: 17-19).

As the race, however, come into existence in birth, it is plain that they "die" "in Adam" through *generative entail* and as natural generation is the divine order of race-reproduction, it follows that the responsibility for their enthralled condition belongs to God and that they are entitled to the offer of deliverance.¹

While therefore the fallen condition of the race is the immediate result of the fall of Adam, the responsibility for their involvement in the fall reverts, in the last analysis, to the Creator Himself who equipped man with the genital organs and decreed that he should "Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth" (Gen. 1: 28).

Deliverance for all the Race is Implied in Redemptive Revelation.—The protovangel (Gen. 3: 15) was the divine pledge

¹ If deliverance is due to the race, how can "eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord" be "the free gift of God" (Romans 6: 23)? "Eternal life" and deliverance are not equivalents, it is answered. Man "in Christ" is much more than restored to his original status. He is a "new creature" (2 Cor. 5: 17) and partakes of the "divine nature" (2 Peter 1: 4). The Gospel therefore not only vindicates the divine justice but it also mediates the divine grace.

for the *common* deliverance of the race, since the "seed" of the woman should *destroy* the serpent in whose fatal folds all generations would be encoiled automatically at birth. The establishment of the New Testament economy was in antitypal fulfillment of Old Testament typology and the sin-offering on the Day of Atonement (Lev. 16) was typical of the "Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world" (John 1: 29).

Deliverance is Available to all the Race.—Promise and prophecy are gloriously fulfilled in the Messianic advent and the Creator's responsibility for the fallen condition of the race is faithfully met in the mystery of the incarnation in which God and man are in essential union at the fountain of the race-life. The "seed" of the woman (Gen. 3: 15) proved to be the Son of God (Matt. 3: 17) as well as the Son of Man (John 3: 13). An analysis of His Person, moreover, discloses the immensely significant fact that, while He is a member of the race by birth (Matt. 1: 25), He is also the "last Adam" (1 Cor. 15: 45) by incarnation (John 1: 14). He therefore assumed not only individual human nature but also the human *order of life*. As He thus became the spiritual Progenitor of man, the race-life in His Person was cleansed at Calvary and the race who "die" in the loins of the first Adam are, through the "last Adam," "begotten of God" without taint of sin (1 John 3: 9).

The unity of the race was, however, broken at the death of Abel and the two divisions of the living and the dead are in different states of existence. Mutual relations are disrupted and they are debarred alike from intercourse and intercommunication. Redemptive revelation was, however, made to the *living* or for the living. Thus the divine assurance was given to Abraham that in him should "all the families of the earth be blessed" (Gen. 12: 3). The Prophet Daniel foretold, not only that the Messiah's kingdom should be indestructible but also that it should be *world-wide* (7: 14). The Apostolic Commission makes mandatory the evangelization of "all the nations" (Matt. 28: 19). Does it, however, follow

that the evangelization of the dead is not involved in redemptive revelation? No. The dead, like the living, are divided into natural humanity and spiritual humanity. Prior to the fulfillment of the protevangel at the Messianic advent, the teeming myriads of the race, except the slender line of revelation, died without covenant relationship. Nineteen centuries subsequently to the predeclaration of the Deliverer Himself that His apostles should be His "witnesses" "from Jerusalem . . . unto the uttermost parts of the earth" (Acts 1: 8), two-thirds of the billion and a half of the earth's population are dying without the offer of deliverance. The logic of the situation would of itself reduce to absurdity the proposition that the saving function of the Messiah is restricted to the living. But then God is perfect in His works and just in His dealings (Deut. 32: 4) and it is quite unthinkable that redemptive revelation could be inadequate to span the gulf of the fall and that therefore the great body of the race are debarred from the remedial provision of the Gospel. Besides, the assumption of inadequacy, in the premises, would clearly contravene the divine attributes of love (John 3: 16) and omnipotence (Gen. 17: 1). As, moreover, the state of death is, in fact, a condition of the fall itself (Rom. 5: 12), it follows that the dead are included in the promise of deliverance (the destruction of the serpent) and the assumption that death precludes the challenge of the Gospel would be absurd as well as illogical.

Preliminary Evangelization by Christ Among the Dead.—Fallen human nature in the Person of Christ made Him mortal and His advent was necessarily also to the dead. His descent "into the lower parts of the earth" (Ephes. 4: 9), like His appearance on the earth, was Messianic. The believing dead who, "having had witness borne to them through their faith, received not the promise" (Heb. 11: 39), without doubt recognized in Him the Messiah just as their living co-religionists had done. Did He also perform the function of preliminary evangelist among them as He had done among the living (Mark

1: 14, 15)? Yes. St. Peter, having prefaced that His vicarious suffering was for man's reconciliation to God and that He was "put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the spirit" (1 Peter 3: 18), made the following unqualified assertion: "In which (disembodied state) also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison" (V. 19). The Greek verb here translated to *preach* means, primarily, to *proclaim* as a herald and, although it is transitive, the subject of the proclamation is not here designated. The writer, farther on in his Epistle, however, left no room for conjecture as to the omitted or implied accusative by asserting definitely that the *Gospel* was preached "even to the dead" (4: 6). Nor did he leave it doubtful that the ministry of Christ among the dead was truly *evangelistic*. He assumed that the *Gospel* would be the universal standard of the judgment. "For unto this end was the *Gospel* preached even to the dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh," he reasoned. Thus the *Gospel* is preached to the living who accept its terms and are saved by its provision, or they reject the offer of deliverance and become accountable for their fallen condition. The *Gospel* thus becomes automatically the standard of the judgment for men. On the other hand, the great body of the race have had no opportunity, "in the flesh," to accept or reject the offer of salvation and manifestly could not "be judged according to men in the flesh" unless the *Gospel* were actually preached "even to the dead." To judge them by a standard of which they could have no knowledge and to whose requirements they had no opportunity to conform, could not possibly be sanctioned by the moral law. If, moreover, the *Gospel* provision were not made available to the dead, they could not be judged, at all, and the final destiny of the race would remain in perpetual suspense, since the general judgment would be impossible.

Does it appear, however, that the *Gospel* was preached to the dead that they might accept its terms as well as be judged by its standard? Yes, plainly as the writer's second reason

in point indicates: "but that they might live according to God in the spirit" (disembodied state). It is equally plain that the dead to whom the Gospel was preached were also "dead" "in Adam" and that they could not possibly "live unto God" without being "made alive" in Christ (1 Cor. 15: 22) by the grace of the Gospel.

Evangelization by the Church Among the Dead.—Christ at the beginning of His ministry, like John the Baptist (Matt. 3: 2), announced that the kingdom of God was "at hand" (Mark 1: 15). On the eve of His ascension, moreover, He charged the apostles not to depart from Jerusalem but to "wait for the promise of the Father" (Baptism with the Holy Ghost), assuring them that they should be qualified for world-wide evangelization (Acts 1: 4-8). The anticipated event was the actual coming of the kingdom of heaven on the day of Pentecost, or, in other words, the establishment of the Christian Church as the divinely instituted agency for the world's evangelization and the medium of the administration, by the Holy Spirit, of the entire provision of the Gospel. That the Church was thus meant to be the administrative custodian of the Gospel is evinced by the language of its Founder at the consecration of His apostles to the mission of evangelism: "Jesus therefore said to them again, Peace be unto you: as the Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and said unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whose soever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven unto them; whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained" (John 20: 21-23).

At this point the scope of revelation becomes material and the question arises, Did the Holy Spirit fall on the *dead* at Pentecost as well as on the living?

The deductions of logic, like the dictums of revelation, are authoritative in discussion and the logical answer to the question is in the affirmative. As faith survives the incident of death, the spiritual attitude of both the living and the dead believers was plainly *identical*. Faith, moreover, is not a

mental abstraction but a concrete spiritual factor. Its content is the revelation itself by which it is evoked. The objective revelation as thus appropriated by faith becomes not only the inspiration of the believer but also the vital principle of his spiritual being. Redemptive revelation, furthermore, was not only objective but it was also *personal*. Thus the "seed" of the woman, in the genealogical climax, was *Christ* and the "rock" which followed the Israelites in the wilderness, in its symbolism, also was Christ (1 Cor. 10: 4). It was thus Christ in *prospect* that was the content of Old Testament faith.

As thus the faith of the pre-Christian believers was vivified by the indwelling of the *ideal* Christ, it follows that the believers among the dead were in the attitude of *expectancy* at Pentecost as well as the believers among the living.

It would seem, moreover, that the faith of the dead in the Messianic advent was clearer and stronger than the faith of the living. Thus they were free from the material influences which diverted the faith of the living from the Messianic ideal of a spiritual ruler to that of a political King who should overthrow the Romans in Palastine and reestablish the Jewish commonwealth. Nor was Messianic faith among the dead dependent on the sacred writings for the authentication of its object. It was therefore not liable to be unsettled by their misinterpretation, mutilation or interpolation. Instead, the original bearers of Messianic revelation to the living (Adam, Abraham and the prophets) had always been at hand, after their own death, to attest, in person, the verity of the protevangel and the covenant and to reiterate the Messianic prophesies. Their mere presence among the dead was, in fact, the sufficient sanction of the Messianic promise to the believers whose faith in the Messianic advent therefore not only remained wholesome but also grew stronger.

It is reasonable, furthermore, to assume that the advent of Christ among the living was communicated to the dead prior to His appearance among them. Thus, for example, the aged

Simeon had brought them the tidings that the "Lord's Christ" was presented in the temple (Luke 2: 26). John the Baptist had more recently announced the appearance of One in Palestine upon whom, at His baptismal consecration, the Holy Spirit descended and whose sonship received vocal acknowledgment from heaven (Luke 3: 22). Whose works of mercy and might, moreover, proclaimed Him as "He that cometh" (Matt. 11: 13).

As, now, the faith of the dead in the Messianic promise was not only unperverted but also highly enlightened, it follows that, unlike the living, they promptly recognized the Messianic character of Christ at His descent to them. Did they also expect the coming of the Holy Spirit after He had risen from the dead? Yes. St. Peter's assertion that Christ preached to the contemporaries of Noah, is only an example from which to deduce His evangelistic mission to the dead in general. As, however, the advent of Christ was specifically to the *believers* (Jews) among the living and the purpose of His ministry the authentication of His Messiahship to their faith, He doubtless performed His Messianic function, "in the spirit" (disembodied state), also chiefly among the *believing*² dead. And it is reasonable to infer from Matt. 20: 19 and John 16: 7 that He also foretold to them His resurrection the third day and the subsequent gift of the Spirit.

As, now, the human condition of Pentecost was *faith*, not, however, in the *ideal* Christ of the Old Testament but in the *actual* Christ of the New Testament and as the Holy Spirit fell on the believers at Jerusalem whose faith in Him had been evoked by His presence and teaching,³ the inference seems warranted that the believers in the realm of the dead, who, at His *personal challenge*, had accepted Him as the Messiah, likewise received the Pentecostal effusion.

Indeed the order of man's deliverance itself would make

² Christ's assurance that the penitent on an adjacent cross should be with Him in Paradise attests His communion with the righteous dead.

³ The assumption is reasonable that Christ appeared to the believers among the dead after His resurrection as well as among the living.

illogical a negative answer to the question propounded. The protevangel was fulfilled practically, not at the birth of Christ, nor at His death or resurrection but at the pouring out of the Spirit. In fact, the emancipation of the Deliverer Himself from the thraldom of the serpent was consummated only at His resurrection from the dead and therefore subsequently to His ministry among the dead. And it was only in climactic sequence to His complete "glorification" in His ascension (John 7:39; 14:16) that He sent the Spirit as the administrative Agent in the kingdom of heaven (John 3:5; 16:7-14; Acts 13:2, 4) through whose regenerative function men are automatically freed from the serpent in their penitent submission to the Gospel-ordinance for the remission of sin (Acts 2:38; 22:16) and the new birth (John 3:5).

Such being the order of the promised deliverance, one of two things must be true. Either the Spirit fell also on those among the dead, at Pentecost, who had accepted Christ at His descent to them or they still remained under the Old Testament institutions. If the latter alternative were the true one, the New Covenant would have been established in *addition* to the Old Covenant instead of supereeding it. It is plain, however, that such an anomaly in historical revelation was quite impossible. The Church has necessarily been identical with itself at every stage of revelation. As it is an organism (Col. 1:18), it could not possibly become Christian among the living and remain Jewish among the dead.

As then the Christian economy superceded the Jewish economy, at Pentecost, among the dead as well as among the living, the inference seems warranted that they, like the living, received "power" to become "witnesses" of Christ and that the evangelization of *all* the race was thus inaugurated. The belief is justified, moreover, that the progress of evangelization among the dead is many times greater than it is among the living, since the "world" and the "flesh" are eliminated at death.

Do the Scriptures, however, sanction the conclusion of logic

that the dead were the subjects of the antitypal revelation at Pentecost as well as the living? They seem to. Thus the writer of Hebrews, having eulogized the heroes of faith who died prior to the fulfillment of the Messianic promise (11: 4-38), asserts (vs. 39, 40) that "these all . . . received not the promise, God having provided some better thing concerning us, that apart from us they should not be made perfect." The "better thing" is the fulfillment of the Messianic promise and therefore implies the actual deliverance of the New Testament believers from the serpent. The "perfecting," however, is to be attained only at the resurrection from the dead (second advent). As, now, the Old Testament believers who "received not the promise" in their lifetime are to be "made perfect" with the New Testament believers ("us") at the resurrection, what will be their religious status in the meantime? If the content of their faith were only the *promise* of deliverance, it is quite plain that they would remain, for the numberless ages of the first advent of Christ, in the Old Testament attitude of *expectancy*. Such a situation is manifestly impossible. It is, however, in full accord with the Scriptures to conclude that their faith in the Messianic promise was transferred to the Messiah Himself at His appearance among them as the outcome of His suffering for sin in fulfillment of the prophecy of one of the most illustrious of their own number (Isa. 53: 5). It is furthermore in harmony with the Scriptures that their faith in the *dead* Christ, which was not saving faith⁴ was transferred to the *risen* Christ at Pentecost in ful-

⁴ Old Testament revelation was not soteriological but promissory. "For it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sin" (Heb. 10: 4) is St. Paul's negative estimate of Old Testament atonement. The two goats of the sin-offering were but the symbolic prefiguration of the "Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world" (John 1: 29). The principal events of revelation exemplify the law of cause and effect and are not in irrelative succession but in necessary sequence. Thus, for example, atonement is causal for forgiveness. As therefore it is "the blood of Jesus" that "cleanseth us from all sin" (1 John 1: 7), it follows that the removal of sin could not have been contemplated in the Old Testament expiatory ceremonial. Indeed the

fillment of the Messianic promise ("better thing") also for them.

Furthermore, St. Paul, having declared the supreme exaltation of Christ from the synclinal of His humiliation (Phil. 2: 8, 9), affirmed the universality of His sovereign sway: "That in the name of Jesus every knee shall bow, of things in heaven and things on earth and things under the earth" (v. 10). As "things under the earth" are dead men, it follows that the realm of the dead is a *constituent* of the kingdom of heaven.

As, now, the subjects of a kingdom are also its *constituents*, it follows that the first citizens of the kingdom of heaven among men came into existence simultaneously with its establishment at Pentecost. As this kingdom is "not of this world" (John 18: 36), citizenship in it is, moreover, conditioned on a new birth: "Except a man be born anew, he can not see the Kingdom of God" (3: 3) and the Holy Spirit *alone* is functional for the new birth: Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God" (v. 5). If then the reign of Christ was inaugurated also over the realm of the dead at *Pentecost*, it follows beyond controversy that the believers among the dead were constituted citizens of His kingdom in the effusion of the Spirit as well as the believers among the living. It is also more reasonable that the Christian Church was established among the dead through the Pentecostal outpouring than automatically through the subsequent death of Christians.

The Old Testament economy was the historical expression of the protevangel and the hostile activities of the Old Testament people were typical of New Testament evangelism. The "seed" of the serpent was the line of Cain in which the "natural man" (1 Cor. 2: 14) in his moral declension became akin to Satan (Ephes. 4; 17-19). The "seed" of the Hebrew verb, to make atonement (*kaphar*), does not mean to remove but to *cover*. It would, moreover, be the acme of absurdity to hold that the "seed" of the woman freed men from the serpent prior to His nativity, since, in the nature of the case, He could become functional for man's deliverance only at His assumption of man's nature.

woman was the line of Seth in which the moral sublimation of man eventuated in the human fatherhood of God. The promised deliverance was conditioned on the divinely inspired enmity between these two branches of the race and it was only after ages of battle that the mutual hostilities ultimated, on the one hand, in the crucifixion of Christ ("bruising" of His "heel") and, on the other, in the atonement for sin ("bruising" of the serpent's "head").

Is, however, the active agency of the people of God against the serpent under the protevangel paralleled under the Gospel? Yes, very plainly. Thus the office bearers in the kingdom of Christ are His agents: "As the Father hath sent me, even so send I you" (John 20: 21). They are, moreover, world-traversing evangelists: "Go ye therefore and make disciples of all the nations" (Matt. 28: 19). Nor is neutrality in the war against Satan possible: "He that is not with me is against me" (12: 30). They are the citizen-soldiery (Christendom) of the kingdom of heaven who follow this militant King on war horses (Rev. 19: 14) to conquer the world (v. 15).

It is quite immaterial here whether all this relates solely to the living or not. St. Paul asserts that, "in the name of Jesus," those "under the earth" should bow the knee as well as those "on the earth." They are therefore actual citizens of His kingdom. As, moreover, citizenship is functional for the ends for which kingdoms exist, it follows that the *active agency* of their citizens is implied.

Does the kingdom of Christ, however, exist among the dead for their *evangelization*?⁶ Yes, since the King Himself, prior to His investiture with the sovereignty, performed the function of preliminary evangelist among them.

Thus was the divine responsibility met in the inauguration of *race-extensive* evangelization and divine justice vindicated.

SOMERSET, PA.

⁶ A second probation is not implied in the offer of the Gospel to the dead. Probation is conditioned on the moral nature which may become hardened beyond the possibility of repentence, even prior to death, by the persistent rejection of the gracious overture and evil excesses.

V.

THE REALIZATION OF THE SOCIAL IDEAL OF
JESUS.

FREDERICK C. NAU.

No question challenges thought more persistently today than the social question. Men on all the planes of intelligence are thinking about it. There is unceasing agitation among all classes and ranks of men, which is caused by the constantly awakening social consciousness of our age. There is widespread social unrest. It is the chief characteristic of our time. There are many reasons for this, but all arise from one, the remarkable growth of democracy within the past century. The conviction has grown among the working classes and the poor, that the common people are not receiving their just portion of the world's wealth. The people have been lifted up to elevations, from which they have gotten glimpses into the life and conduct of the highborn and privileged of this earth, and the result has been that they have become disillusioned, and have lost all respect for such wealth and power as do not rest upon the eternal principles of righteousness. The sting of social contrasts is felt as never before. The spread of education, the invention of machinery, the gathering of the people into the cities, the discussion of social problems in organizations of working people, the founding of people's parties, the widespread circulation of the daily press and weekly and monthly magazines, the preaching of social principles from pulpit and soap boxes—all these things have aroused the people, and convinced multitudes that they are not receiving justice at the hands of the modern world. The inevitable result of this is popular discontent, often sullen and ominous, and very often loud and clamorous agitation. Some fear that

this unrest and clamor bode ill for the future. They tell us we are on the verge of an impending revolution which will violently shake the superstructure of society from its foundations. I have no fear of such a calamity. Society will not be reconstructed in that way—by a sudden, revolutionary uprising. We are always in the midst of revolutionary movements of some kind, political, economic, educational or religious. They indicate that the race is progressing, and moving on toward higher planes of life. Ideal conditions will not come in a day, by one great act of legislation or by one mighty upheaval. They will come gradually, "first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear." Revolutions are the accompaniments of evolution, the eddies and cross-currents in the resistless stream of evolution. When growing social tendencies and developing social instincts meet with deeply established institutions and customs, there are bound to be clashes, big or little revolutions. Sometimes it will be a tremendous civil war or labor war, then it will be a tempest in a teapot, like the struggle of English policemen with militant suffragettes. But back of all and in all is the eternal principle of social evolution. History is the unfolding process of the life of men and nations. The life of society is an educational process. The divine education of man is going on without ceasing, and in this great educational process Jesus Christ is the chief factor. He is "the teacher sent of God." His social ideals are leading the race as the star led the wise men of old. His social spirit has been working like leaven in the life of humanity.

I. WHAT ARE THE SOCIAL IDEALS OF JESUS?

They are the innate social instincts of man in full bloom. They are rooted in the ages before his incarnation. There never was a time when man did not experience sympathy and fellow-feeling for his neighbor. The mother and tribal instincts have always asserted themselves in the race of men. Henry Drummond said: "Life is not only a struggle for self-

existence, but also a struggle for others." The social ideals of Jesus are the perfect expression of the Hebrew social principle, that God made the world for the many and not for the few only. It is interesting to note the development of the social spirit of Israel as leading up to the social teachings of Jesus.

In ancient Israel the interest of man in his fellowman reached a higher stage of expression than in any other race. When Moses, under the inspiration of Jehovah, entreated Pharaoh "to let the people go," he gave expression not only to a racial predilection, but to a deep social passion. The Exodus was a proletarian uprising, an emancipation of industrial serfs, as well as a great religious movement. Among the Hebrews, religion and social and political affairs were inextricably interwoven.

In Leviticus, the year of Jubilee was ordained as a year for special religious celebrations. But during that year industrial "liberty was proclaimed throughout all the land, to all the inhabitants thereof." Men's relations to property were to be adjusted in the fiftieth year. The poor man who had failed economically, or who had been exploited by another and robbed of his land, was to have his property restored to himself again.

The Hebrew Theocracy was also a democracy. God was the supreme King. The people chose an earthly king and then accepted and obeyed him as God-appointed. The Jewish Kingdom of God was a social order far superior to that of Egypt, Assyria or Babylonia.

The Hebrew prophets were social as well as religious teachers. They were God-inspired men, political leaders, and social seers. They were the champions of the poor and the oppressed. They were dominated by lofty social ideals unknown outside of Israel. The visions of Isaiah, Jeremiah and Daniel of a future Messianic Kingdom are pictures of a renewed society. The castigations of the idle, profligate rich by Amos were prompted by a passionate love for the people.

The inspiring message of the Hebrew prophet certainly was that a mighty social leader would come and deliver Israel from political and social injustice.

Jesus was the flower of the Hebrew race. He gave perfect expression to the social consciousness of Israel. He was the new social man, and His was a new social Gospel. He was the universal man. Phillips Brooks, in a striking sermon, said: "Jesus was the incarnation of the eternal humanity." He came from the bosom of the Father.

Jesus used the old, time-honored expressions of lawgiver and prophet, but he amplified, deepened and perfected their meaning. He also proclaimed social truths that were entirely new.

His social Gospel is rooted in His doctrine of the "Kingdom of God." To Jesus this Kingdom meant far more than the reestablishment of the Jewish theocracy. He taught that it would not be established by external forces. "The Kingdom of God cometh not by outward observation." It is not to "be taken by violence." It would be a kingdom of humanity without a visible king, court, or legislature. It would be inward and spiritual in its nature. "Behold, the Kingdom of heaven is within you (or among you)." It would have a humble beginning everywhere, would grow and expand like a mustard seed among Jews and Gentiles alike, until it became a great tree overshadowing and blessing nations and institutions. It would work like leaven in all the kingdoms of the world. Jesus advanced upon the position of Hebrew prophets, in that he made the universality, in fact the whole truth of the Kingdom, rest upon the doctrine of the Fatherhood of God. The Fatherhood of God is the basal fact in the Kingdom of God. All social principles are involved in that great fact. If God is our Father, then we as members of the human race are his children, and thus constitute one great human family. If God is our Father, then the earth and the fulness thereof belong to Him and His family. His children are, therefore, to share His material possessions, as well as His spiritual love.

They are to be obedient to Him, and to render account to Him as sons do to their earthly fathers.

Out of this idea of Fatherhood grows quite naturally the doctrine of the brotherhood of man. Jesus here transcends the Hebrew social ideal by removing the barriers that the Jews imagined existed between them and other nations. He was no respecter of persons. All men, of whatsoever race or color, are to live together as brothers. The law of sympathy, consideration, coöperation, and of helpful love, is the Christian law of association.

But while exalting brotherhood, Jesus stood for the highest development of the individual. "Be ye perfect even as your Father in heaven is perfect." He insisted on the regeneration of the individual as the essential condition of membership in the Kingdom. The individual must always consider himself a part of the entire brotherhood, and as such should be the highest type of brother, because of his relations and influence. The success of the brotherhood will depend upon the life of the individual member. "Ye are the light of the world." "What can a man give in exchange for his life."

He taught many other principles for the regulation of men's relations with one another. He set forth the secrets of true success and greatness in the Kingdom. "He that loseth his life for my sake shall find." "He that would be great among you, let him be the servant of all." "By love serve one another." The gospels reverse the commonly accepted standards of the Roman civilization of that time, when they make the law of service and sacrifice the secret of success and greatness. They esteem the power of material possessions lightly, and exalt moral and spiritual values. "The life consisteth of more than the abundance of things which a man possesseth." "Blessed are the poor in spirit for theirs is the Kingdom of God." "Blessed are the meek for they shall inherit the earth." "Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled." Jesus warns against the dangers of riches. They may interfere with the growth of character, and may keep the individual out of the Kingdom.

I have briefly stated the fundamental ideas of Jesus for the uplift, regulation and progress of human society. Jesus outlined no social program, he effected no organization, but he lived the perfect social life, and in parable, epigram and simple discourse, he revealed the eternal principles for the perfection of society.

His principles were vigorously preached by his followers. They were reinforced by their preaching of the death and resurrection of the Son of God. How were they received by Jew and Roman? The common people heard them gladly, but the rich, the officeholder, the ruling classes opposed them. The social ideals of the Nazarene sought to enter the various spheres of Roman society. They succeeded partly, but generally they were resented as unwarranted encroachments upon vested rights. They precipitated a conflict.

II. THE CONFLICT BETWEEN THE SOCIAL IDEALS OF JESUS AND INDIVIDUALISM.

Extreme individualism was characteristic of the civilization of the Roman Empire. It was its primal essence. It manifested itself chiefly in the form of imperialism in the state and in the Roman industrial life. The conflict was between two different conceptions of life, the Christian and the Roman. The one held that the world was created for the benefit of all men, while the other was that the world is for the benefit of the few. It might be said that the history of Europe and America, during the past 1900 years, has been the history of the struggle for supremacy, between these two conceptions of life and society. It has been and is still the conflict between democracy and individualism in their various forms.

Bloody persecutions were carried on to stamp out the new Christian sect and their unwelcome doctrines. The authorities of the empire violently opposed the new religion for three centuries, but it seemed to gain prestige and followers, the more it was resisted. In the fourth century Christianity was recognized as the dominant religion. The temples of the

Roman gods were deserted, many of these were converted into Christian churches, and Rome had become, at least, nominally Christian. In the seventh century the empire was overthrown by Goth and Vandal. The Church was not destroyed by the warring hordes from the north. It survived the fall of Rome. But it had already, to a great extent, lost sight of the simple spiritual and social teachings of the Master. It had adopted the forms of the Roman imperial government, and many forms of Rome's pagan religion, and it now reared its head proudly above the ruins of the state as an imperial, ecclesiastical institution. It was a doubtful victory for Christianity. The seat of spiritual authority had been transferred from the soul of man to the papal hierarchy. The simple Gospel of Jesus had become hedged in and overlaid by the dogmas of the metaphysician. Jesus himself, the spiritual and social deliverer, had become the metaphysical Christ, the mysterious divine-human being, to be worshipped only as the second person of the Trinity. I am not questioning the truth of the dogmas about Christ, but I am convinced that the Christian Church suffered irreparable loss, when the emphasis was shifted from the simple teachings and the divine life of Jesus, to the dogmas and syllogisms produced by ecclesiastical councils. The Christian religion conquered Romanism in the state, only to be absorbed by Romanism in the Church. The age of imperialistic Christianity was the age of despotism and darkness in Church and state. But emancipation had to come. The world calls the emancipator Demos; the church calls Him Christos.

Emancipation came in the sixteenth century, next to the nineteenth the most progressive and significant century of the Christian era. The Reformation was a signal victory for the Gospel of Jesus and the common people. It was a tremendous blow that Luther and Zwingli, on the continent, struck at hierarchical Christianity. It liberated the mind of the believer, unfettered his soul, removed insurmountable ecclesiastical barriers, and gave him free access to God. By giving

to the world an open Bible, the right of private judgment, and the free evangelical congregation, the Reformation set in motion remarkable socializing forces.

Puritanism in England became the foe of imperialism. It fought valiantly against tyrant in church and state. It gave vigorous expression to the social ideals of Hebrew prophet and Christian teacher. Of course, there was much of the old spirit of the Roman dictator in Cromwell, but when the Cavaliers of Charles I. were defeated by the Ironsides of Cromwell, it was a distinct victory for the rights of man. Puritanism with its Calvinistic doctrinal basis did wield arbitrary power, but it was moral power; it did inspire fear in men, but it was the fear of God. No Puritan feared king or priest; like his great reformer, John Knox, he never feared the face of man. The Puritan movement in England, Scotland and America has been one of the mightiest of movements in history against extreme individualism in church and state, and a constant guardian of that true liberty which is based upon respect for the law of God. With all its inflexible doctrines, and "blue laws," Puritanism has cleared a wide path for the onward march of the social ideals of Christianity.

In France the Hebrew and Christian conceptions of society met in conflict with absolutism. Back of that holocaust of 1789, the French Revolution, was the cry of an oppressed and outraged people for bread and justice. Voltaire, the cynic, who taught the people to hate popes and kings, and Rousseau, the sentimentalist, who taught man respect for every other man, high or low, sowed the seed of the revolution. But they, the heirs of Luther and Calvin, were both irreligious men. The French Revolution was both inspired and led by unchristian men. If Mirabeau and Robespierre had been men of faith and prayer like Cromwell, the fruits of this bloody political and social upheaval would have become an incalculable blessing to France and the whole modern world. But, although Christ was eclipsed by the goddess of reason in the revolution, it did mean a triumph of the Christian ideal of the

rights of man over the rights of Bourbon kings. It was a blessing in disguise, a case of God making the wrath of man to serve Him.

All of these political and religious revolutions are unmistakable evidences of the ceaseless working of the social leaven of Christianity in the bosom of the centuries.

In the realms of science and philosophy, too, weapons were forged for the battle against extreme individualism. These have always been effective socializing factors in the race.

The Renaissance brought classic literature out of almost forgotten graves, and emancipated the minds of scholastic students who had become mere servitors of papal authority. The invention of the printing press disseminated old and new knowledge among the masses. The new astronomy, which supplanted the geocentric with the helio-centric theory of the universe, gave to scholars and laymen a new world-view. When men began to see that the universe was boundless, that there is an infinity of space, then they began to question the infallible authority of those who had fixed systems of truth for them, for time and eternity, on the basis of a theory of the world, that science had now disproved.

The new philosophy, which gave to men the theory of the relativity of all knowledge, helped to undermine the imperial authority of the pope in the realm of truth. Science and philosophy, consciously or unconsciously, vindicate the prophecy of Jesus: "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." They are both most potent forces for the establishment of Christian truth, and effective socializing forces as well. One of the Christian's most humiliating reflections must always be, that the Church in the past too often battled against the progress of science.

In the economic and industrial world the struggle between the Carpenter of Nazareth and employers of labor has been no less marked than in other spheres. Individualism has always asserted itself in industry, from the days of the taskmasters in Egypt to our time. The new social order of Christianity first

met in conflict with the patrician and slave-holder of the Roman world. The vast majority of the Roman people were slaves. Many rich Romans, after joining the new Christian Church, liberated slaves, whilst others treated them with more consideration than before. Slavery, the ownership and management of human beings as chattels, can never long endure under a religion that insists upon the truths that personality is divine, and that all men are brethren. Back of every movement in history for the abolition of slavery, whether of man or woman, has been the unfailing social dynamic of the Christian religion.

In the industrial realm Christianity has fought its battles with Feudalism also, and gained many victories. The great land system of Europe in the Middle Ages and later, was called Feudalism. The democratic ideals of Jesus could not easily express themselves under this iron-bound system. The few who had inherited or conquered land, were the land owners. The many who lived on the lands and did the work, were the tenants. They were the subjects of the feudal lord, to whom they owed unquestioned allegiance. In times of peace they were pledged to him as laborers, in times of war they were sworn to fight his battles. The right of private property was denied the many. The lords owned the vast estates. Above them stood the king, who was the final owner of all, by divine right. Such a system is the very opposite of Christianity; and yet many feudal lords were devoted churchmen. The laws governing property rights in England today are still largely feudalistic heirlooms of the Middle Ages. In Mexico the system of peonage which is a kind of feudalism—perhaps worse, is now happily passing from the modern world, thanks to the fighters for social justice in Mexico, and the pressure of Christian diplomacy from without.

The economic system that superseded feudalism we call capitalism. It is about one hundred and twenty-five years old, dating from the time of the French Revolution. Capitalism means the private ownership and control of property, the private investment of moneys for commercial enterprises; in a

word, the right of any man or woman to secure, own and manage some of the natural resources of the world, or the elements of artificial wealth. The breaking up of feudalism and the advent of capitalism was a great gain for society. It tended to make the individual member of society a free and active force in the development of the earth's natural resources and in the building up of the material structure of modern civilization. The rise of capitalism was marked by the invention of machinery, the introduction of manufacturing, the development of commerce. Whatever may be the wrongs that capitalism has inflicted on the community, it has certainly been a great boon to the common people. Its first great blessing was the decentralization of wealth. The wealth of the world is no longer represented in unimproved lands; it is represented in mines, factories, ships, railroads, cultivated farms, etc. Wealth certainly has never before been so widely distributed as today under the commercial and competitive system. Commercialism compels the man of wealth so to use his wealth that the world shares it whether it will or not. The era of private capital has been the most progressive in history. During this era the common man has had a chance to strive and to attain. The masses have never numbered as many investors and depositors in savings banks as in our time. Under capitalism the greatest commercial, educational and religious institutions have been built up and have flourished.

But we are not blind to the evils and dangers of our present industrial system. We are told that we have achieved in our country political and religious freedom, but not industrial freedom. They tell us that real social freedom is in the iron grip of capitalism, and thus powerless to be born.

The social ideals of Jesus are indeed in fierce conflict with present capitalism; not because the system is wrong in principle, but because it is dominated by forces alien to the spirit of democracy and the welfare of the masses of the people.

Our modern industrial life is, no doubt, dominated by selfishness, and especially the selfishness of the strong and successful.

There are elements of feudalism still lingering in our commercial system. It is with imperialism in industry, feudalism in business, with Romanism in the whole economic sphere, that the social conscience of our age is at war. One of the menacing tendencies of capitalism since our Civil War, has been the centralization of wealth. In its youth capitalism meant decentralization, the distribution of wealth; but within the last half century, men have learned how to use money in many new and questionable ways for their own enrichment. They have learned how to exploit the wage-earner so as to use his wealth-producing power for the accumulation of vast millions. They have learned how to speculate in stocks and securities, and make a million in a day. The speculator gambles with our daily bread, our clothing and our shelter. He corners the market, throttles the law of supply and demand, and fixes prices of commodities from the standpoint of desired dividends. The trust and corporation are the gigantic results of this education in the use and abuse, the management and manipulation, of capital. While feudalism had its monopolistic landlord, capitalism has produced the trust-magnate, the railroad-magnate, the oil-king, the coal-baron, the insatiable plutoocrat. And the amazing thing is that many a big capitalist, and many who belong to his political party, will fondly nurse the belief that society is dependent upon his management of the country's wealth, and that laboring men ought to be devoutly thankful that capitalists are furnishing employment for them. They deny to labor a voice in the matter of employment; they deny to labor the right to organize for the security of good wages; they refuse labor the right to work, if profits are not as great as they expected. The capitalistic system is indeed a profit system: Its motive is the securing of profits. Its dynamic is self-interest. For material profits men will lie and steal, will crush the life out of undeveloped children, will drive weaker men to the wall, and will barter away the riches of the inner life. Keir Hardie says: "The workman under capitalism is a serf. He has no right to employment, no one is under obliga-

tion to find him work, nor is he free to work for himself, since he has neither the use of land nor the command of the necessary capital." Morris Hilquit, America's ablest socialist writer, says: "Capitalism fails conspicuously in the equilibration of demand and supply. Under it, the production and distribution of wealth is planless and anarchical." Alfred Russel Wallace, in his last book, calls the "present system under which England is living, the worst in the world's history." These statements are extravagant, but there is much truth in them. Surely, it is difficult for the social ideals of Jesus to be realized under a system, characterized by self-seeking and the worship of mammon. The private material profit is too great and the social and spiritual gain too small, for the present system to be in harmony with the social conscience of the age.

What is the remedy? What is the solution of the problem? What will aid the Christian conception of life, the Christian ideals of society, rooted away back in Judaism and moving steadily down the path of the ages to this 20th century, what will aid this civilization to completely triumph over the imperialistic conception of life and society, rooted away back in the Romanism of the Cæsars?

There is no definite, cut and dried solution of the social problem. Its solution is wrapped up in the evolution of the race, in the Providence of God. But there are forces at work and movements on foot today, that are the fruits and victories of the social conflicts of the past, and promising and powerful aids to the realization of the highest social ideals of the race in the future.

I refer to the various

III. MODERN SOCIAL MOVEMENTS.

Let me call attention to a few of these. They are all, either directly or indirectly, furthering the cause of social Christianity. I can dwell on them only with brevity.

The social sciences taught in college and university are sowing the seeds of social reconstruction. Our young men and

women in their academic courses are studying sociology and are learning to think of man and all life from the viewpoint of society. Nearly every commencement sermon or address bids the graduate go out and enter the service of humanity. Modern education is a powerful factor in the development of the social consciousness.

"Modern socialism" is bitterly attacking the system under which we live, and is challenging and disturbing thought in our time. It compels us, by its audacious claims, to listen to it.

Utopian socialism has failed. The communism in Jerusalem, the schemes of Fourrier and Owen, the communistic settlements in Ohio and Indiana, have all failed for the same reason, namely, the lack of incentive to action and achievement for the strong, ambitious individuals of the community.

Scientific socialism has succeeded the dreams of Utopian socialism. Karl Marx is its founder. It is claimed that he considered all Utopian schemes futile, and through his monumental work, *Das Kapital*, made socialism scientific, proletarian, militant and international. His theories are at the heart of every socialistic program of today. The names of Engels, Bebel, Jaurès, Hilquit, Debs, Berger, are familiar to all who have given any thought to Marxian socialism.

The object of this type of socialism is the abolition of the capitalistic system. To accomplish this, the workers of the world are called upon to unite. The earth belongs to the people; therefore its products should be equitably distributed among them. The capitalist is a robber, because he holds and controls what, by right, belongs to the people. All private capital is robbery. So these socialists vehemently argue. Let us examine their claims.

The economics of socialism are based on two theories. The first is called the "economic interpretation of history." In Germany it is known as the "materialistic conception of history." All history is the record of the struggle of individuals and classes for material things, for food, clothing, shelter, for riches and conquests. This is a half-truth. It does not take

into account the marvelous influence of science and art, invention and discovery, philosophy and religion, and all the transforming moral and spiritual ideals of men, in the making of history. The true interpretation of history must always be in the light of Jesus' prayer: "Thy Kingdom come."

The other fundamental economic theory of socialism is its theory of wealth and "surplus value."

"Wealth," say Marx and Spargo, "is the product of the application of labor to natural resources." All wealth is produced by labor. Therefore, it belongs to labor. Whatever the capitalist takes, after labor is paid its wages, is surplus value. All profits, interest, rents, are the unearned increment in industry and should be abolished. This theory of wealth is fantastic. It is unprovable, because in a complex society like ours it is absolutely impossible to determine how many forces enter into the creation of wealth. No man can be given the exact equivalent of what he produces, because the quantity and quality of his production can never be even approximately known. Socialism forgets nature's law that unequal brain and brawn, unequal energy and skill, cannot long receive an equal reward.

The ethics of socialism are the nature ethics of Rousseau, and of modern writers like Ibsen, Shaw, H. G. Wells, and the Swedish critic Brandes. The latter, on his recent tour of America, said: "The United States has far too few divorces. It is still influenced by old woman doctrines of morality." Marriage is a social compact, to be dissolved whenever it pleases the parties to so agree. The children are not seriously considered by them. Let the socialist state care for them. This theory would undermine the family, which is the unit of society. It is not wrong to steal, nor to refuse to pay rents, if you are poor or out of employment, because the capitalist is a robber, and has no natural right to the money you take, or the rent you refuse to pay. Moral laws are not static, not forever fixed. They must change as humanity advances and its life develops. With Nietzsche the educated socialist believes that the ancient moral code was framed by the masters for the government of slaves, by

the strong for the management of the weak members of society. The ethics of socialism are not the social ethics of Jesus; but in one thing socialism leads in expressing the social ideals of Jesus, and that is, in combating war and furthering peace among nations.

The religion of socialism is the religion of humanity. It knows no personal God. Marx was educated under the influence of Hegel and Feuerbach. He believed in the Hegelian doctrine "that the absolute comes to consciousness only in humanity," and God, or the absolute, was to Marx only the projection of his own ideal into the objective world. His intelligent followers are all, more or less, atheistic and materialistic in their thinking. Socialism claims Jesus as its own. In that magnificent "Labor Lyceum" in the heart of Brussels, there is a large painting of Jesus in one of the halls. The guide will tell you that Jesus was a great labor leader, died a martyr to the cause of the laboring classes, and that he was persecuted and killed by the capitalistic class. Socialism claims Jesus as one of its founders, but it does not accept the religion of Jesus. It does not pray and commune with God as Jesus did. It hasn't his conception of God nor his conception of sin and salvation. Sin, vice, crime and human misery are all due chiefly to bad environment, says socialism; change the environment, and you change the man. Jesus taught that the heart of man is sinful and that all the evils of life issue from it: thus, change the heart and you change the man. The prodigal son went wrong in spite of a fine home. He found salvation only after he experienced a change of heart, repented of his filial dereliction, and returned to his father.

The religion of socialism, the ethics and economics of socialism, its philosophy of life and history, all have some good in them, but the half-truths and fallacies of the scheme are so palpable that the race will never accept it as the final solution of the great social problem.

It is negative in its thought and tendencies, and no negative movement can ever triumph. It seeks the destruction of the

present order of society; it arrays class against class; it is more denunciatory than didactic, more belligerent than peace-making; it is intolerant and iconoclastic, and thus must eventually fail as a remedy for the ills of humanity. But it is rendering a service to society that must not be overlooked. It is awakening the people out of their orthodox stupor, by calling attention to gross injustices, by frightening capitalistic imperialists, and by driving thoughtful men to think more seriously about social problems. And this is needful service, for, as Professor Rauschenbusch remarks, "too many people take every existing system for granted, just as they do their stomachs." Like a scourge of God it has driven many to social repentance, but it cannot give social salvation. It cannot long hold the stronger elements of society, because of its extreme and shallow philosophy of life. It is essentially materialistic, and it moves on the surface of things. It fails to satisfy the deeper life of man. Professor Eucken says, "Modern socialistic movements, beneficial as they may be, are in the nature of the case, superficial, for they do not touch the reality of the spiritual life."

The unanswerable argument against socialism is the old, trite argument, which like Banquo's ghost will not down, namely, that it fails to provide for the true freedom and conservation of individuality. For his proper development man must have great freedom of action in the material world. His ambition to excel in the race of life, his innate sense of ownership, his bee-instinct for accumulation, must not be destroyed lest he be deprived of powers essential to his manhood. New incentives must be given man to find the great central reservoir of the Spiritual Life, but the old, legitimate incentives to action and achievement in the material world must not be taken away from him. Socialism unconsciously is opening ways for the progress of Christianity, but it has not the key to the solution of all of life's problems, as it claims. It lacks the one thing needful—the power and secret of leading men into the depths and riches of the spiritual life.

What will become of socialism? It will be gradually sup-

planted by more positive social movements. Its new and true principles will be appropriated by these. It will eventually be absorbed in larger movements.

Such larger movements are very much in evidence in our time. In Europe they are the Liberals and Social-Democrats, in America they are called the Progressives. They are active in the political world, but they are social at heart. In England they are seeking the emancipation of the people from landlordism, in Germany from imperialism in state and industry, and in America from the feudalism still ruling in the capitalistic system. These parties are all one in motive. They demand the greater rule of the people. They aim to elevate man above the dollar, to bring capital into the service of humanity. They hold, with Socialists, that the industries should be conducted for the benefit of the people and not for profits and dividends. In industry they stand for profit-sharing and coöperation. They want industrial democracy, in which labor shall have its just share of the wealth produced, and a voice in the management of the industry.

This is broader and saner than socialism. It is in line with historical development. It is a corrective of state socialism, and a reasonable promise of a fair and more equitable distribution of wealth. The most notable demonstration of the possibilities of industrial democracy is the profit-sharing plan of Henry Ford, now working satisfactorily and beautifully in Detroit, Mich. The proof of the desire of the people for "progressivism" in the political sphere, is found in the recent successes of the Liberals in England and the Progressives in the United States. When nine millions of American voters cast their votes for politico-social platforms, as was the case in our last presidential election, when the Progressive, Wilson, received six millions, and the Progressive, Roosevelt, three millions of votes, there remain few doubts that the social conscience of the people has been aroused, and that men are eager to follow high political and social ideals. These movements appeal to the thoughtful masses far more powerfully than socialism does,

because they are progressive without being destructive. They stand for the socialization of government and industry, but also for the conservation of the individual. They maintain a reasonable balance between socialism and individualism.

But the greatest movement that is making for the realization of the social ideals of Jesus is the Christian Church, and especially the modern movement in the Church. I have no time to dwell on modern theology in this paper; I only wish to say that the modern conception and interpretation of the Christian religion are more social than the old. Their starting-point is the Fatherhood of God, and out of this truth issue all the social principles for the social redemption of the race. The Church is the largest movement of all for humanity's social salvation. She will eventually absorb all lesser movements and lead the race to its predestined goal. The Church has no program to offer, and no political party to endorse in these modern times. It is her mission to preach, teach, inspire and lead. It is her duty, in the spirit of Christ, to give to the world the social Gospel, with its fundamental doctrines of the Kingdom, which are the universal Fatherhood of God and the universal brotherhood of man, with all the principles that are involved in these fundamentals. She must set her face against extreme individualism, in whatsoever forms it may assert itself. Her voice must ever be heard against Imperialism and Romanism in state, church, and industry. To be true to her exalted Head, she must advocate the principles of Christian democracy, and herself be a democracy. The Church must preach brotherhood and be a brotherhood in word and conduct. She must awaken the social consciousness of men; must convince rich and poor, capitalist and laborer alike, that man has a social origin, and that he can realize and find himself only insofar as he knows himself to be in social relations. Sin must be set forth as a social act, the cause of social disorder and ruin, for no man can sin only against himself, since no man liveth unto himself. Social and corporate iniquities will be fearlessly denounced by the true minister of the Gospel.

The Church of today should demand the socialization of wealth, the Christianization of capitalism, and the social regeneration of all members of society. She should seek the abolition of poverty among all the deserving; the employment of wealth in the service of mankind; the just distribution of all the products of industry among employers and employees; and the fraternal coöperation of capital and labor. She should teach the principle that work is a social function. Plowing and reaping, digging and building, buying and selling, investing and managing, teaching and preaching—every type of labor should be considered a social function; and all the philanthropic and missionary work of the Church should be looked upon as social service. Church work and daily toil should both be called Christian work: both kinds of work are sacred, and both are types of social service. Education, science and art should be made the servants of the people. It is encouraging to see how education and science are being popularized in our time. Some may think that art will disappear from our church worship when the Church gives up her allegiance to imperialism in theology and polity. The beautiful forms of worship in the Church are not the product or possession of ecclesiasticism. They are matters of art and art will abide. The noblest art may be employed, and should be, to adorn the worship of the common people. I protest against the idea that a church for laboring people must be plain and barnlike. Rich and poor alike should worship together "in the beauty of holiness." So it is the mission of the Church to let the social spirit be manifest in her doctrine, her work and her worship.

But the supreme business of the Church is to hold aloft the doctrine of the spiritual life. The social and spiritual are indeed intimately interrelated. But in practice, we are all dualists, and do think and act as though the social and spiritual were separate entities. Jesus did and so must we. The minister should place first things first; the spiritual precedes and underlies the social. The Church must spiritualize the social motive and passion of men. This is so necessary in our time,

when so many who come under the influence of social teachings, drift away from their church. Men must be inspired to call upon the name of the Lord. They must be taught that the power they need most of all is spiritual power, and that it comes from above and not from abroad or below. They must be taught that the regeneration of man is necessary in order to the regeneration of society. They must tarry in Jerusalem, until they be endued with power from on high. Through prayer, preaching and the sacraments, the Church must keep her people in vital touch with God. She must teach them the privilege and secret of communion with the Father.

The great message of the modern Church should not be anything less than "Christ and him crucified." This will mean the bringing of men—sinful men—into unity with God and harmony with one another. It will be the preaching of the atonement, a social truth. "I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me." Dr. John H. Jowett, in a striking sermon, says: "The irresistible magnet that will draw all men to one spiritual center is the uplifted Christ. His drawing power is the energy of sacrificial love. The cross stands in the center of the great circle of humanity. It is the center of brotherhood. From the wide-sweeping circumference, countless radii pass to the center. These radii are the paths that the feet of all men should tread, and a true church will direct their feet into these paths that lead to the uplifted Christ. And what will be the result? As men move down the radii and approach the crucified Lord, they will approach one another." The nearer they come to the center, the nearer will they come to one another; the closer they get to their one common Lord, the more will they realize that they belong to one common brotherhood, for they will be conquered by His divine love, and will believe Him when he says: "One is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren."

When will the full realization of the social ideals of Jesus take place? No man can fix the time. The goal is set—it is the goal of history. The Church should always lift up her

eyes and look into the future, for her redemption draweth nigh. Hebrew and Christian civilization will some day triumph over the Roman. The Christian democracy will be established in all the earth. When will the Kingdom be here? When will that new heaven and earth appear wherein dwelleth righteousness? This is the Father's secret. "It is not for you to know the times or the seasons which the Father hath put in His own power." "But ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you, and ye shall be witnesses unto me unto the uttermost parts of the earth."

The Church should always be busy in the present, doing the duty of the hour, and confidently, hopefully, and prayerfully assuring men that the time is coming when "the kingdoms of this earth shall become the Kingdoms of our Lord and His Christ."

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

The sources which gave inspiration and material to the writer are chiefly the following:

- VEDDER. "Socialism and the Ethics of Jesus."
SKELTON. "A Critical Analysis of Socialism."
SPARGO. "The Substance of Socialism."
RAUSCHENBUSCH. "The Social Crisis."
R. J. CAMPBELL. "Christianity and the Social Order."
GLADDEN. "Christianity and Socialism."
ABBOTT. "Christianity and Social Problems" and "Hebrew Prophets and American Problems."
The Debate on "Socialism" in "Everybody's" Magazine, between Ryan and Hilquit. 1914.
JOWETT. "The Transfigured Church."

READING, PA.

VI.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

OUR HOME MISSION WORK. An Outline Study of the Home Mission Work of the Reformed Church in the United States. By Charles E. Schaeffer, D.D., General Secretary of the Board of Home Missions. Publication and Sunday School Board of the Reformed Church in the United States, Fifteenth and Race Streets, Philadelphia, Pa. Cloth. Pp. 263.

The efficiency movement has captivated the leaders of the churches of America. They are studying ways and devising means to make their work more efficient. This is especially true of the vast missionary enterprise of the Christian Church. In the early ages, missions were largely an individual passion for souls. And the missionary was a chivalrous knight of the cross who went forth, without purse or scrip, as a lamb among wolves, to gain converts to his faith. These heroic servants of the Church achieved magnificent results, but today their efforts would be dubbed knight-errancy. They would fail, as all haphazard methods do whether in religion or in business.

To succeed in its great missionary task, the modern Church needs no less passion for souls than its medieval forerunner, but, in addition, it needs an effective organization and efficient methods to apply and adjust its spiritual force to the vast field, at home and abroad. And these, in turn, require thoroughgoing study and reliable information. No Peter the Hermit can lead our modern missionary crusade to success. Instead of arousing the transient emotions of vast multitudes with fiery eloquence, we organize Mission Study Classes, where facts make their sober appeal to the mind and conscience of earnest students, and where solid information is made the basis of permanent inspiration. And thus we are in a fair way of engendering in our young people a missionary zeal that will have light as well as warmth, an intelligent consecration to the spread of God's kingdom on earth.

The book under review is intended primarily for Mission Study purposes in the Reformed Church. The author's aim was to furnish a manual of instruction, and he has succeeded admirably. But he has done more than produce a repository of facts and figures. They are merely the skeleton of his book which he has clothed with a living garment of deep spiritual insight into the larger meaning of Home Missions. One should begin the study of the volume with a perusal of its last chapter, entitled "The Larger Meaning of Home Missions." It strikes a note that was never heard in the past, and is still intoned too rarely. But it is the real keynote of the vast enterprise of Home Missions in America.

And then, with one's vision enlarged and ennobled, one may proceed to study the work of Home Missions in the Reformed Church, from the founding of the first congregation in the early decades of the eighteenth century to the present time. That work, in all its various phases, is presented topically in seven chapters. They are packed with accurate information, garnered from many sources. The human forces and the material resources that went into the making of our Home Missions are marshalled vividly; the genesis, growth, and present status of each phase of the many-sided work are set forth clearly; our territory is carefully analyzed, and the needs and claims of city and country are presented.

Dr. Schaeffer's book is a valuable addition to our denominational literature. It possesses an inspirational quality that is rare in books of this sort. It is well written and carefully indexed. It will become an indispensable aid in furthering the cause of Home Missions within the Reformed Church.

THEO. F. HERMAN.

SOCIAL CHRISTIANITY IN THE ORIENT: THE STORY OF A MAN, A MISSION AND A MOVEMENT. By Rev. John E. Clough, D.D. New York, The Macmillan Company. Price \$1.50 net.

This is the story of the life and work of John E. Clough, D.D., a Baptist-Missionary to the Telugus in Southern India. It is in the form of an autobiography, though written by his wife, Emma Rauschenbush Clough, Ph.D., his companion and helper in all his trials and triumphs.

Dr. Clough has been called the Apostle to the Telugus; and his achievements justify the title. Before his appointment the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions had, on three separate occasions, considered the advisability of closing the mission. Under his leadership, however, it attained unprecedented success. At the end of five years the mission had fifteen hundred members, and many adherents; and when what he calls the time of ingathering came, converts came by the hundred and by the thousand, seeking baptism.

The book gives a first-hand picture of life in India. It contains an answer to many questions, which are asked with reference to the contact between Christianity and the Oriental religions. It gives an account of the social revolution which the Christian religion introduced among the low caste people with whom Dr. Clough labored; and it furnishes an excellent illustration of how the gospel of Jesus transforms, not simply the individual, but the entire community. The book is the record of a singularly devoted and successful missionary life, and is a worthy addition to the growing missionary literature of our day.

WILLIAM C. SCHAEFFER.

THEY WHO QUESTION. New York, The Macmillan Company. Price \$1.35 net.

"Here is a stirring novel the theme of which, like that of Winston Churchill's *The Inside of the Cup*, turns upon pressing questions of everyday religion." It is thus that the publishers speak of this volume; and the claim is justified by the contents. An absorbing love idyl runs through the entire story; yet the whole story turns round questions of absorbing religious interest. In this respect it is like Winston Churchill's *The Inside of the Cup*; and yet it differs from that in two important particulars. In that the religious questions are largely dogmatic; in this they are almost exclusively practical. In that the difficulty in the way of faith is found in the imperfections, the insincerity, and the shortcomings of professed Christians; in this it is found in God's providential dealings with men. As in the book of Job, the all-absorbing topic is the problem of "unmerited suffering." From the first chapter to the last, the story voices the age-long cry, "How can a just God allow it?"

The several characters of the story are all made to pass before us in such a way that each is seen with his own peculiar cup of woe. The heroine of the story, Lady Enid Curney, is a singularly pure, chaste, and religious character; yet her life is full of sickness and sorrow. Her first-born child, even from the day of its birth, suffers constant and excruciating pain, so that her faith, originally so pure and childlike, finally suffers eclipse.

The author's solution of the dark problem is not given until at the end. He turns it over and over again in the experiences of his several characters, until the reader wonders whether he has a solution to offer. When at last it is given, it is put into the form of a beautiful sermon by the aged Dean of Melincourt, the central thought of which is that all "unmerited suffering," like that of Jesus, is vicarious; and that all who endure such suffering are in a profound sense sin-bearers, for the salvation of their fellows. Among other things the Dean is made to say: "There is a vast brotherhood in the world whom we need, or who need us. There was One we know whose deep affections for his fellow men saved them, and as he has saved so we too must save them. There are still sin-bearers in the world. We know that this is so in our daily lives; and that every true servant of God is, in some sort, a sin-bearer. We look on ourselves as isolated beings, but that is not God's way of looking at us, and before we can understand this, we must cultivate the universal element in our nature. The true self is universal not individualistic. . . . Most of us think that we bear a sufficiently heavy burden when we accept the punishment of our sins; but that does not appear to be God's plan for us. No one who has ever set out to fight for God's cause but has been wounded in the fray, and why should it

be otherwise? No one has ever tried to be ordinarily unselfish but he or she has not had to bear the sins of the selfish."

The volume is anonymous. The only hint of its authorship is contained in the following statement of the publishers. It is "undoubtedly the work of a well-known writer, who prefers, for reasons of his own, to remain anonymous." Whether he be well-known or not, he has given us a clean, absorbingly interesting book, which any one may read with pleasure and profit.

WILLIAM C. SCHAEFFER.

THE STORY OF PHÆDRUS: HOW WE GOT THE GREATEST BOOK IN THE WORLD. By Newell Dwight Hillis. New York, The Macmillan Company. Price \$1.25 net.

"A little of fiction, a little of history, and a little of legend have entered into the composition of this tale of early Christian days." So, in part, runs the legend on the first page of the wrapper in which this book is sent forth. It would perhaps be more nearly correct to say very much of fiction, and very little of history have entered into the composition of this tale. One's judgment of the book will hence differ according as he approaches it from the standpoint of romance or of history.

As a fictitious tale, the book is both interesting and fascinating. The author is a literary artist. The story is well told. The slave boy, Phædrus, is made to pass before us in a number of vivid scenes, which are painted in a wealth of beautiful imagery. The book is concerned with one of the most fascinating of themes, in which every Bible student is and should be interested. Who does not want to know how we got the New Testament, the greatest book in the world? Round this theme Dr. Hillis has woven a most fascinating story; and considered simply as a story, the book is no doubt a success,

It is when one turns to the other side that he feels disappointed. There is much less of history than one would expect from the sub-title; and what of history there is is unfortunately not reliable. If the author had been as diligent and careful in laying his historic foundation as he was in painting his picture and in embellishing his tale, the student, who has some knowledge of how the New Testament was formed, would find more satisfaction in reading his book. On page 308, in one of the historical notes at the end of the book, in which he is certainly not consciously romancing, he says that Codex A goes back to 320 A.D.! On page xviii of the preface, he says: "One thing is certain,—recent discoveries in the East prove that Mark, Luke, and Matthew used a common source for many of their pages"; and then he goes on to assert that this common source is "Q." The fact is that discoveries in the East had nothing at all to do with convincing scholars that there are common sources back of our Synoptic Gospels;

and there are, at least, some New Testament Scholars, who doubt whether Mark knew anything at all about the "Q" source. One can hardly avoid the conclusion that, if the author had leaned less heavily on his imagination and depended more upon a careful study of the facts, he would have written a different book. However interesting the book may be as fiction, it gives neither a correct nor an adequate conception of how we got the greatest book in the world.

WILLIAM C. SCHAEFFER.

VITAL ELEMENTS OF PREACHING. By Arthur S. Hoyt, Professor of Homiletics and Sociology in Auburn Theological Seminary. Published by the Macmillan Company, New York, 1914. Pp. 326. Price \$1.50 net.

This is a refreshing book, although it guides one along a familiar and hardbeaten highway. The librarian may have some difficulty in classifying it, as it may be placed with equal right in either of the departments of homiletics or pastoral theology. It deals mainly with preaching and the pastoral office. "The Called Man," "The Vision of Man," "The Human Touch," "A Man's Gospel," are specimens of the fifteen chapter headings, which indicate the author's scope and method of treatment. The value of the human and social quality in preaching is the dominant thought. This does not weaken, but rather enhances the divineness of the sacred office.

The previous works by the author on "The Work of Preaching," and "The Preacher," have not dulled his talent for his special line of work. This latest volume is fully justified both by the substance and style of its contents. While the several chapters are announced as lectures, there is no suggestion of the dry atmosphere of the conventional lecture-hall. And while quotations abound, aptly chosen from a wide range of homiletic literature, the book is entirely free from the mustiness of the library. From the brief preface on through the closing chapter, the thought-movement blends happily with the currents of human life. Consistently do the method and style of the author illustrate "The Vital Elements of Preaching."

Dr. Hoyt has given a new message on what one is more fully convinced, after reading the book, is the most needful, most helpful, and most rewarding work of every age. The book will prove to be a richly suggestive help, not only to students preparing for the Christian ministry, but no less to veterans in the service.

J. C. BOWMAN.

GOD'S PATHS TO PEACE. By Ernst Richard. New York-Cincinnati, The Abingdon Pres. Pp. 108. 75 cents net.

This booklet, as it is modestly styled by the author in his foreword, has far greater value than its brief page-limits would in-

dicate. To Mr. Richard belongs the distinction of being the founder of the New York Peace Society, president of the German-American Peace Society, lecturer on the history of German civilization in Columbia University. This statement is made simply for the purpose of information, and not with a view to begging for the booklet a favorable reception. Were the author unknown the book would still commend itself strictly on its merits. The title—God's Paths to Peace—at first thought would imply a religious appeal on the part of an idealistic dreamer in behalf of an organized peace movement, a trite preaching, made to glow afresh with fervent enthusiasm. Quite the contrary. There is no impassioned appeal to emotion; there is no play on religious feeling. The booklet is a study in the evolutionary processes making for world peace. God's paths are traced through the evolutionary process which make for peace through the various periods of history down to the present stage of "world-righteousness." From the frith, the Anglo-Saxon for "peace," of the family, to that of the clan, extending to greater social units, the small people or folk, to the large tribes, to the nation, and finally to the brotherhood of nations, the author traces the development of the peace-movement on to what he regards as the final stage of evolution, that of universal peace. Assuming that evolution is the law of human history as well as of nature, war may retard it for a time, but never can stop it. In a few brief chapters, covering less than one hundred pages, the author presents a compact mass of informing facts which carry with them the power of conviction, without any need of formal argument. He shows how all the forces of civilization have combined for the promotion of internationalism, the advancement of the mutual welfare of the nations. Science, art, commerce, labor, sports, education, and the mind itself, all have become more and more internationalized. And best of all, there is an international heart, and along with it there is gradually being developed an international conscience. Especially interesting are the facts which he cites with regard to the growth of world congresses, whose scope covers every field of human activity. Since the beginning of the present century there has been an annual average of one hundred meetings of world congresses. In these congresses the great achievements of mankind in all fields are made known, and plans for new progress proposed. Directly, or indirectly, the interests of universal peace are thereby conserved. It is reckoned that there are today no less than from six to seven hundred permanent international organizations. Equally interesting is the history of the evolution of international arbitration, showing its growing influence, not only in number but also in importance and beneficent results. One is surprised to learn of the large number of instances of settlement of international differences, preventing in not a few in-

stances resort to arms. Nor is there a single case on record when the losing nation did not submit to the arbitral decision, though the popular indignation could be placated only by great self-discipline. These various lines of enlarged human relations, tending to bring the nations more closely together, the author regards as the unfolding of natural laws. In them he sees the ways chosen by God to realize the prophecies of the Prince of Peace. So that the booklet, notwithstanding the emphasis placed on evolution, has religion in the background of all its thought, and carries with it the implication that the spirit of brotherhood, which is the spirit of Christianity, is the inspiration of all movements tending toward peace. The present terrible conflict of the nations does not prove the futility of the peace movement of the ages. It proves that the nations have not yet succeeded in freeing themselves entirely from the primitive instincts of violence and distrust, and that the weakness of the powers is to be found in the fact that the policy of governments still rests too largely on might instead of right. In spite of the present insane and inhuman conflict of nations, the eternal forces of human progress, irresistibly, though slowly, converge to the desired goal of Universal Peace. This is the logical and hopeful conclusion of the author's argument, based on the natural processes of evolution, which are "God's Paths to Peace."

J. C. BOWMAN.

RESTATEMENT AND REUNION, A Study in First Principles. By Burnett Hillman Streeter. Int. VII-XXII. St. Martin's St., London, Macmillan & Co., Ltd. Pp. 194. 2/6 net.

The author of this book, dean and lecturer in theology and classics of Queen's College, Oxford, has become widely known because of his prominent part in the production of "Foundations," of which he was editor and to which he was perhaps the ablest contributor. That work, the joint product of seven Oxford men, appeared a little more than two years ago, as "A Statement of Christian Belief in Terms of Modern Thought." It was at once accorded high rank as a contribution to liberal and constructive theology. The book now under review is in the same class with its notable predecessor. The author, in the opening statement of the Introduction, claims that "the book is not controversial but constructive." This claim is fully justified by the general contents of the book, but, unfortunately, in the Introduction the author betrays undue sensitiveness to the dissenting views expressed by the Bishop of Oxford in his pronouncement on "The Basis of Anglican Fellowship," and in his defense is led very close to, if not across, the controversial line. His protest against the Bishop's implication "that difficulties as to the Virgin Birth, the Physical Resurrection, and the Nature Miracles are

only felt acutely by those who base their criticism on a mistaken view of natural law, and on something less than a Christian belief in God," is of no interest to the general reader. Even the most liberally inclined are losing interest in the discussion of these disputed problems, while the "orthodox," as a result of the continued discussion, are likely to become more firmly entrenched by resistance than swayed away from their ancient moorings. And Christians generally, as they look at the dust which is stirred up by the conflict of theological opinion, ask, What boots it? Of what avail for spiritual enlightenment and comfort? The Introduction does not fairly introduce the contents of the book, but tends rather to detract from their high value. It is not in keeping with the uncontroversial, positive and constructive character of the book, and with the compliant and charitable spirit of the author.

Under the general title of Restatement and Reunion, the contents are included in four chapters: I. The Simplicity of Christianity; II. Authority, Reunion and Truth; III. What does the Church of England Stand For?; IV. The Conception of the One Church.

Briefly and very happily does the author define what he regards as the essential principles of Christianity, which may serve as a comprehensive basis for both a restatement of doctrine and a reunion of the various branches of the Church. In making his noble plea for the supremacy of the essential principles of the Christian religion, he does not exclude the valuable services rendered by theology, philosophy, and criticism. Rightly does he maintain that the center of gravity of Christianity does not lie in theology, and that entrance into the Kingdom of Heaven does not wait on the verdicts of philosophers, historians, and critics. In the emphasis which he places on the essentials of Christianity he points the better way, in which may be revealed unto babes things which have escaped, and are likely to escape, the wise and understanding. Love, which issues in a passion for service, will ever be the supreme test of a true and living faith. Prayer, meditation and work, are the ways whereby men are kept in communion with God and advance his Kingdom on earth.

The second chapter, on "Authority, Reunion and Truth," Shows the lack of authoritarian power on the part of the Church, because of her conflicting doctrine of beliefs and a consequent lack of efficiency for successful coöperative work. As the first and greatest need is truth, the question is discussed as to the source from which truth can best be obtained. The answer is, the christocentric principle, applied to the sphere of practical religion. The life of Christ on earth is the highest manifestation of the nature and life of God. Truth is actualized in life by fellowship with God in Christ. The knowledge of this truth

comes not through scientific research or philosophic analysis; it comes not as an achievement of the ratiocination of the thinker, but rather as "the expression of the spiritual experience of the mystic"; through an intuitive apprehension of fundamental principles, rather than by the acquisition of a knowledge of details obtained through what is known as the scientific method; by a mastery of eternal moral and religious values, rather than by a mastery of the knowledge of concrete facts. The author does not attempt to define positively the form of restatement and reinterpretation required by the changed conditions of thought and life. His plea is that the divided branches of the Church draw more closely together, first for coöperation in good works, and then for the discussion of belief. A discussion, accompanied by prayer and pursued in a spirit of charity and kindly concessions, with truth as the single aim, will prepare the way for a consensus of Christian belief, broad enough to serve as a basis for a federated union of the Churches, which would give an authority to faith which the Church in its divided state at present lacks and at the same time would conserve the power of the Church by avoiding the waste and misuse of spiritual energy through efforts to maintain and strengthen separate denominational interests.

In the chapter on, What Does the Church of England Stand For? the author seeks to show the characteristics which differentiate the Anglican Church from the Roman Catholic and the several great Protestant Communions. Her theology he traces to the Greek Fathers, in contrast with the Augustinian system. For a supreme authority, based on Orders, he makes no claim. He credits his Church with "comprehensiveness" as its distinctive mark, a spirit of sanity, balance and moderation, the love of truth. The ideal, as interpreted by the Church of England, is a synthesis of Hebraism and Hellenism. To other denominations he accords a large share of these same qualities, and acknowledges the great value of the principles for which they severally stand. His sweet reasonableness and broad charity qualify him to a high degree as a champion of the cause for which he pleads—that of closer union of all Christian bodies.

"The Conception of One Church" is discussed in the concluding chapter under three parts: (1) From Unity to Disruption; (2) The Preliminaries of Reunion; (3) The Problem of Intercommunion. In the first part the author gives a concise, scholarly survey of the history of Christianity in its struggle to give formal expression to the ideal unity of the Church, and at the same time shows how, on the part of the Church in all past ages, failure to realize that ideal conspicuously appears along the lines of doctrinal and governmental development. But notwithstanding the failures there has been both a negative and positive preparation in the history of Christianity, which warrants the hope that sooner

or later the prayer of Jesus for the oneness of his disciples will be fulfilled. The discussion of the Preliminaries of Reunion and the Problem of Intercommunion suggests valuable practical helps intended to strengthen the growing hope. The book merits high commendation for its clear and vigorous thought, while its value is enhanced by the spirit of piety, sincerity, and kindness which characterizes the author throughout his discussion.

J. C. BOWMAN.

A MAN AND HIS MONEY. By Harvey Reeves Calkins, stewardship secretary in the Methodist Episcopal Church. The Methodist Book Concern. Pp. 353. Price \$1.00 net.

This book is published under the auspices of the Commission on Finance of the Methodist Episcopal Church. It is a strong and clear statement of the principles and practices of Christian stewardship.

The origin and development of the general idea of ownership are discussed in the opening chapters of the book. The author claims that the conception of ownership and possession which has permeated the social order for centuries is pagan and not Christian. He traces the general idea of ownership through the history of the race and shows that in the Roman code the essence of ownership was the legal power to hinder others from using or enjoying one's possessions. He emphasizes the fact that the purpose of ownership with the pagan is to hinder and not to help.

Christianity repudiates this pagan doctrine and "recognizes possession, honorably acquired, as a token of confidence on the part of the Divine Owner." Christianity begins not with the Stoic Law of Nature as the fountain head of jurisprudence, but with the acknowledgment of God as Owner. Human stewardship is the necessary correlate of divine ownership. Even in the Old Testament, it was established for the first time in human history that men are to hold all their possessions, as a steward holds the possessions of his master, absolutely subject to the call of the Owner.

The author shows that there was a very distinct relation existing between Pentecost and Property. The early Church taught not a communism of possessions but stewardship. There was no compulsion, neither was there any general turning of possessions and goods into money, for the purpose of general distribution, but only "as every man had need."

The writer of this interesting and helpful book passes from the first to the eighteenth century and shows that the community of Herrnhut by adopting this Christian idea of stewardship and putting it to practical use gave an impetus to the missionary labors of the Moravian Church. He shows further that the principle of stewardship practiced by the early Methodist Church in America performed wonders for the Kingdom of God.

After tracing his subject historically the author skillfully differentiates the principle of stewardship from other principles and forms of economic organization. He shows very clearly wherein the principle he advocates differs from socialism.

His treatment of the subject of value is interesting. He lays down the proposition, economically sound enough, that the content of money is essentially spiritual, for value in its ultimate analysis is a spiritual force, making its final appeal to the whole man's sense of rightness or fitness, and money is the measure of value. The pursuit of money is and ought to be a spiritual calling. Money-making need not appeal to the sordid instinct of man; it may appeal to the finer elements of man's higher nature.

In the practical application of his principle the author develops these three ideas: (1) A recognized obligation of stewardship, without a program, is not intelligent. (2) A narrow, local or provincial program will frustrate its own purpose. (3) An intelligent program demands a fair understanding of the modern problems and opportunities of the Kingdom of God.

The book as a whole is a worthy presentation of a great theme. It will be helpful to ministers and laymen alike. The book is clear, thoughtful, sane and inspiring.

H. M. J. KLEIN.

OUR SPIRITUAL SKIES. By Charles Coke Woods. New York, Eaton and Mains. Cloth. Pp. 232. Price \$1.00 net.

The author of these meditations seeks to touch the deeper movements of life and experience in such a way as to show that their significance is spiritual. He contrasts the Christian view of life with the Agnostic's conception of the Universe, with the Fatalist's scheme of things and with the Materialist's explanation of facts. He illustrates his principle of the supremacy of the spiritual from the pages of Life, of Literature and of Scripture.

He shows light on the dark things of human experience by showing in a beautiful way how they may be called into the high and holy service of the soul. Not by philosophers and cults will shadows be overcome, but only by the life of Him who is the Master of the Shadows.

In drawing on the world of literature for the support of his faith in the truth of spiritual supremacy, the author has written several chapters on "The Soul as interpreted in Tennyson's *In Memoriam*," "Shakespeare and the Soul," "A Literary Study of the Soul as portrayed by Robert Browning." The writer of this book has a delicate and discriminating sense of the finer elements in English Literature. He shows too how these elements may prove to be of the greatest value as means of spiritual culture.

"The Skyward Look from Scripture" is the sub-title given to the third part of the volume before us. The author shows that

the spiritual conception of life as found in the Old and New Testament gives broad outlook and extensive horizon to life. At least twenty-five short chapters, full of suggestion, germinal thoughts, are devoted to the exposition of selected Scripture passages with a view to showing, as the writer puts it, "that the soul must have sky." The pages treating of the "Dreamers," "The Persistence of Personality," and "Points on Power," are among the best in the book.

The whole volume is an admirable handbook for the spiritual culture of layman and minister written by a man who knows life, literature and scripture, and who has the ability to make one see and feel that the Christian conception of life not only makes for things that are better but is able to meet the greatest occasions and strains of life with brave heart and confident hope.

H. M. J. KLEIN.

THE ASSURANCE OF IMMORTALITY By Harry Emerson Fosdick. New York, The Macmillan Co. Pp. 140. Price \$1.00

This book faces the problem of life after death from the standpoint of the twentieth century. It discusses the problem in the terms of the modern man. It faces the difficulties which modern thought and the modern attitudes toward life present in the consideration of the question. The author points out first the real importance of the problem, then he shows the inconclusive nature of the arguments commonly urged against a future life and finally he tries to present the positive reasons for a modern man's assurance that death does not end all.

His argument is based on the principle that the cosmic order is rational. He shows that the basic assumption of science that the universe is reasonable supplies a strong foundation for faith in immortality. Further he shows that the basic assumption of religion is that the universe is beneficent. If this be true then of necessity it argues the permanence of personality. A man can not reasonably believe in the goodness of God without believing in immortality. In addition to the fact that the universe is reasonable and beneficent and will certainly preserve its moral gains, we have the testimony of the spiritual seers. Jesus' teaching of immortality has the authoritative value of a verdict from a spiritual seer, but his life has a verifying value, exhibiting to us once for all the sort of character resultant from living as though immortality were true. The character of Jesus in which faith in God is the warp and certainty in life eternal is the woof, is the consummate verification of faith in immortality.

The book is well written, logical in thought, clear in style. It is bound to be helpful to any man who in an earnest and open minded manner seeks light on the great problem of life after death.

H. M. J. KLEIN.

THE SOVEREIGN PEOPLE. By Daniel Dorchester, Jr. Eaton and Mains, New York. Pp. 243. Price \$1.00 net.

This is a trenchant apology for the democracy that is and a noble prophecy of the democracy that is to be. The broad view of democracy is taken, that it is something more than a form of government. Social and religious no less than political, it is defined as "the organic manifestation of the people in their collective capacity, and thus invested with a sovereignty and character distinctly different from the individuals maintaining it." But in addition to these human elements there is a divine power and wisdom operative in the souls of the people, which "while immanent in humanity always transcends it and seeks to subordinate all political theories and parties, all selfish interests of corporations and individuals, to an ever-developing diviner social organism." It is this that gives to democracy its superior right to rule, for while the divine wisdom and power is to be found in any form of government it is present in all the people in greater degree than in any particular class. Hence the judgment of all the people is wiser than the judgment of any class. This conclusion the author finds amply confirmed by the history of democracy. In every great moral crisis, he maintains, when the issue between right and wrong has been clearly presented to the people their verdict has been in favor of the right.

The bearing of all this on the future is obvious. Social progress and well-being will depend upon the degree in which God's sovereignty is diffused through humanity, guiding and controlling the people and instilling in them new ideals; and only as the people become better fitted to obey this divine sovereignty, can their own sovereignty be established.

The book is a thoughtful and stimulating discussion of the social problem, and a real contribution to its literature. It clearly recognizes the importance of religion in social life and development, and postulates for the Church of the future a larger measure of responsibility for social conditions than it has yet dared to assume.

A. V. HIESTER.

SAFEGUARDS FOR CITY YOUTH AT WORK AND AT PLAY. By Louise de Koven Bowers. New York, The Macmillan Company. Pp. xiii + 241. Price \$1.50 net.

The book is the outgrowth of the author's activities and experiences as president of the Chicago Juvenile Protective Association. It clearly reflects the change of emphasis, in recent years, in the treatment of delinquent and abnormal children from punishment to prevention and from prevention to vital welfare. But this change was slow to register itself in legal forms. For it was not until 1899 that the first Juvenile Court Law in the

United States was passed by the Illinois legislature. That the act was altogether incomplete may be seen from the fact that while it provided for the organization of juvenile courts and a probation system to go with them it made no provision for the salaries of the probation officers. To prevent the utter failure of the law a Juvenile Court Committee was organized in Chicago, which for eight years provided the necessary salaries. To keep delinquent children out of the police stations the Committee also maintained a detention home, through which about 2,600 children passed each year. This naturally led the Committee to a study of the causes of juvenile abnormality, and to meet this broader task a Juvenile Protective Association was organized, the first of its kind in the United States. In its efforts to minimize the wretched conditions which demoralize children and breed criminals the association prosecuted various investigations, the results of which have been published from time to time in the hope of stimulating a greater civic concern for the morale of the next generation.

The book is an account of these investigations and the various attempts which have been made to meet the evils disclosed by them. While it deals with conditions in Chicago, its conclusions are applicable to every large city as well as to many smaller ones. The book is singularly free from the morbid and sentimental. It is not the work of a doctrinaire, but a thoroughly sane discussion of an acute urban problem. The preface is by Jane Addams, the well-known head of Hull House.

A. V. HESTER.

THE JUVENILE COURT AND THE COMMUNITY. By Thomas D. Eliot. New York, The Macmillan Company. Pp. xiii + 222. Price \$1.25 net.

This is one of the American Social Progress Series edited by Prof. Samuel McCune Lindsay, of Columbia University. It is not so much a technical treatment of the Juvenile Court as a critical study of that institution in its relation to other social institutions. Not a little criticism has been leveled at the Juvenile Court, possibly because too much has been expected from it, as is usually the case with any social device that succeeds in enlisting public interest and favor. While the book is a criticism of the Juvenile Court it differs from most other criticisms. Other critics have usually contented themselves with attacking particular aspects of the work of the Juvenile Court, but the author contends that its failures have been owing, apart from purely personal considerations, not to accidental excrescences, but to inherent and fundamental defects. He admits that it has been for a time a splendid institution, but that it has now reached the point of diminishing returns in comparison with other agencies designed to deal with the problem of abnormal childhood; and that in the future it will justify its existence only by leading the

way to something better. As immediate substitutes he suggests the school and the Domestic Relations Court.

The Juvenile Court has hardly had enough of a trial, and in many instances hardly a fair trial, to warrant a final judgment. But the book is worth a careful perusal both by its proponents and its opponents.

A. V. HIESTER.

FATED OR FREE? By Preston William Slosson. Boston, Mass., Sherman, French & Co. 1914. Cloth. Pp. 89. Price 75 cents net.

The subtitle of this little book, "A Dialogue on Destiny," suggests its theme and method. It is a discussion in dialogue form of the age-old puzzle of the freedom of the will, using the word freedom in the sense of a partial, or at least potential indeterminism. The author has very cleverly named his dramatis personae in such a way that their surnames indicate their respective philosophic attitudes, and their given names, contemporary or recent representatives of the opinions they defend. "Doctor Clifford Owen Denker" combats the notion of freedom by pronouncing it inconceivable; "Professor Huxley Kohlenstoff" appeals to the scientific assumptions of the universality of causation and the conservation of energy; "Professor Ward M. Manteller" relies upon the success of the statistical method in social science; "Dr. Edwards C. Gottlieb" bases his argument upon the sovereignty of God; and "Mr. Dewey Smith," the pragmatist, attempts to throw the whole case out of court, as without practical significance. Against these redoubtable foes "Mr. James B. Freeman" bravely defends the possibility, probability, and practical importance of a theory of limited indeterminism, summoning philosophers to awake to the possibility of illimitable progress in an indeterminate world.

The dialogue is well maintained, and the author has succeeded remarkably in weaving into the argument all, or nearly all, of the considerations which are relevant to the baffling problem of the will.

RAY H. DOTTERER.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF CHRIST'S TEMPTATION. By George Stephen Painter, Ph.D. Boston, Mass., Sherman, French & Co. 1914. Cloth. Pp. 333. Price \$1.50 net.

The particular incident in our Lord's life on earth which the author undertakes to interpret in these pages has long been perplexing students of the gospel narratives. In a recent volume of "Christian Meditations" Moule discusses at length "the large demands on faith which the account of the temptation makes." Dr. Painter recognizes the same fact, but approaches the study of it from an entirely different angle. The perplexity will never be

removed, he thinks, until in our study of the records we cease to regard them as merely objective and mechanical, rather than inner experiences which are to be accounted for on psychological principles. The interpretation of the "wilderness experience" has tended toward the mystical and supernatural, and thus toward the obscuring of what is thoroughly human and natural in the experience.

The recorded temptation is, in the author's opinion, a typical example of the problems involved in narratives based upon traditions. It presents a literary type, the recognition of whose nature is necessary to gain a valid conception of the meaning and value of the underlying historical facts. Dr. Painter's contentions are set forth in these chapters with a vigor and clearness, born of a deep conviction as to the soundness of his philosophic position, and whether one can or cannot accompany him to all his conclusions, his study of the temptation of Jesus, is suggestive and interesting throughout, and will amply reward readers for the time they may give to the careful reading of the volume.

A. S. WEBER.

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE. By Richard H. K. Gill, Ph.D. Boston, Mass., Sherman, French & Co. 1914. Cloth. Pp. 104. Price \$1.00 net.

The nine brief chapters comprised in this readable and informing book are full of truths needed by Christian workers. In succession they discuss mental and emotional aspects of religious experience, with a firmness and certainty of touch that can leave hardly anyone in doubt as to the flimsy and evanescent nature of the emotional as compared with the worthful and permanent character of rational experiences. This psychological inquiry justifies educational religion by showing that for the attainment of the deeper, the abiding, and the immeasurably more powerful interests of righteousness in life and character, the mind, the heart, and the will must be brought into a reasonable and intelligent harmony with God. This mental experience makes for a vital and permanent devotion to the Christian life, for the lengthening and strengthening of Christian experience, and for stopping the leakage of back-sliding which so often saddens the hearts of religious workers. The methods for Christian work and pulpit effort, suggested by the author, are well worthy of being given careful attention by preachers, Sunday School teachers and parents. In these days when a volatile emotionalism is once more threatening to engulf the saner and enduring educational practices of the Church, the corrective and steady message of a book like this is as seasonable as it is important. It should be widely circulated and prayerfully studied.

A. S. WEBER.

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE IN THE MODERN WORLD. By Francis G. Peabody, D.D., New York, The Macmillan Company. 1914. Cloth. Pp. 227. Price \$1.25 net.

One who has read the *Harvard Review* from its initial number to the current issue has no hesitation to declare that the best and most rewarding of all the articles it has published, appeared in April, 1913, under the title *The Practicability of the Christian Life*. In a revised and slightly altered form, the article reappears in the present volume under the same title as the first chapter. The impressions as to its soundness and value, made when first read, are fully sustained and confirmed by one's second and more careful perusal of it. The force and lucidity of the argument, the beauty and charm of literary style, the keen and kindly criticisms, the competent learning and the catholicity of spirit, one is made conscious of in reading this first chapter, reappear on every page of those succeeding it, and combine to make the book from start to finish one of the richest and most enriching contributions to the literature of Christianity in its social aspects that in recent years has come under one's eye. In his earlier volumes on *Jesus Christ and the Social Question* (1901), and *Jesus Christ and the Christian Character* (1904), Professor Peabody rendered the cause of Christianity a service of unspeakable value. But one risks nothing in appraising the present as being of still greater worth. His presentations of the Christian life (1) in the modern family, (2) in modern business, (3) in the making of money, (4) in the uses of money, (5) in the modern state, and (6) in the Christian Church, are as heart-searching as they are life-inspiring, and, in both these offices, transcendently significant and reassuring. His contentions disclose a maturity and mellowness of character, a balance of judgment and conviction, at almost every point, that leave but little else to be desired. Everyone eager to know the best that is to be had on the pressing questions here so ably and effectively dealt with, will secure and study this book. The outcome of such study cannot fail to warm the heart with a new confidence in the power of the Gospel, and fire the mind with new energy in its proclamation as the hope of the world.

A. S. WEBER.

THE MAN OF NAZARETH. By Frederick Lincoln Anderson, D.D., Professor of New Testament Interpretation in Newton Theological Institution. New York, The Macmillan Company. 1914. Pp. x + 226. Price \$1.00 net.

In the foreword the author frankly describes his viewpoint and his method of study in the preparation of this book. He claims to belong "to no party," but to have attempted to investigate independently and fearlessly, and "to have drawn the picture

of Jesus, which the facts, as I see them, give me. My whole attitude has been historical rather than theological." In his investigation of the life of Jesus he "observes the rules of the critical game," using practically "only the first three gospels, and, even in them, clearly differentiating the sources." The results of his "fourteen years of research" are presented in popular form, so as to meet the requirements of "the ordinarily intelligent man." The pages are not burdened with elaborate critical arguments or with citations from scholarly authorities, which will commend the book, not only to the layman, but also to the preacher and teacher.

One naturally wonders what conclusion about the Man of Nazareth a scholar with such an avowal of freedom and independence, following the historical and critical method of research, will reach. He may be a radical of the extreme sort, or, perchance, a reactionary who finds the Chalcedonian definition of Jesus in the gospels of the New Testament. A statement on page 65 shows clearly that he is neither a radical nor a reactionary. The writer says: "When the clouds of dust raised by centuries of conflict and criticism finally lift, we should see that the naked fact is that *a new type of man, fresh, strong, and unique, appeared in our race in the first century.*" This is the one presupposition with which he begins his sketch of the history and significance of Jesus. Yet it is not to be taken as an *a priori* assumption of the author but as a conclusion of his unbiased investigation of the gospel records.

The presupposition, however, is well worth our consideration, both on account of what it affirms and what it ignores. It asserts in indubitable language the newness and the uniqueness of the type of Jesus' manhood. He was not an ordinary man; there never was one like him. There was something in him that was in no other man before or since. He is, therefore, the beginning of a new species of manhood. It ignores the dogmatic theory of two natures in Christ as the way of accounting for the mystery of his person and the power of his life and work. Of this theory of Jesus' person he says on page 42: "As a sincere attempt to explain the mystery of the personality of Jesus and guarantee his unique greatness and divinity, it is worthy of our respect, but we cannot help feeling that it is mechanical, unnatural, impossible, and without warrant either in Scripture or in experience. Our age demands a more vital theory, more in line with what we know of mental and moral growth, more congruous with the portrait of Jesus in the gospels." We have defined at some length the author's mode of procedure to show that one may adopt the critical method of studying the records of the New Testament and divest himself, so far as possible, of dogmatic prepossessions and popular preconceptions, without surrendering the elements in the person

of Jesus which are essential to his Saviorhood and his Lordship.

It is a mistake to presume, as some seem to do, that in accounting for the life of Jesus in an historical way, the mystery of his person is minimized or explained. His personality, with its latent potencies, is the supreme mystery of history. The historian may trace the gradual unfolding of his life from childhood to manhood and show the influence of heredity and environment on the manner of his life and the form of his message, but the secret of his personality is far beyond his reach. Why Jesus in boyhood and manhood had a unique consciousness of God—the sureness of God's existence, the nearness of his presence, the discernment of his goodness in sunshine and rain, in lily and sparrow, the joyous filial fellowship with him, the absence of a feeling of guilt separating him from God, the sense of responsibility to do his will—all this we may recognize as fact, but why he had it and how he got it is as insoluble a mystery in the twentieth century as it was in the third. In the words of the author, "Men have always asked and are still asking the secret of this personality. It will never be wholly revealed."

In the author's view the greatest historical question about Jesus is his relation to the Messianic ideals of his age. That Jesus thought himself to be the Messiah the author does not doubt; but he is equally certain that he gave the terms describing the popular Messianic hopes new content. He cites numerous passages from the gospels to show that Jesus had the conviction of being the Messiah, not only after baptism but even before baptism. He acknowledges, however, that in considering Jesus' thought of himself before baptism one is on more debatable ground. But Jesus came to the conclusion that he was the Messiah and adopted that title, because it was the only word in his world which was in any way adequate to express the character and purpose of his life. He was far more than Messiah, as that term was popularly understood. The title was not unexpectedly imposed upon him from without at his baptism. "His inner experience of communion with God, his sonship, was the source of his Messiahship. What he was was the root of what he became. He came to think that he was the Messiah, because he found that he had a Messiah's work to do, and that he had within himself the resources to do it." His Messianic work consisted in "sharing with men his joy, his freedom, his light, his energy; to give men his life—a life with God, a life of love and righteousness." We are, however, not to think of Jesus as reaching the conviction that he was the Messiah by a logical process; but rather that "the idea sprang up in him spontaneously and necessarily. He could call himself nothing else, and never thought of calling himself anything else."

After Jesus became certain of his Messiahship, in the sense defined above, he had to face the question, how to accomplish his

Messianic work? In the temptation the author finds the inner thought of Jesus on this subject. Here we see the things which he decided not to do and the things he determined to do. He refused to be the popular political warrior Messiah, conquering the kingdoms of the world, and resolved to effect his spiritual end by spiritual means. His mode of procedure was first to preach the spiritual kingdom and then at last to disclose himself as the spiritual king, "for he thinks the cause of the righteousness of the kingdom is after all summed up in him."

His conception of the nature of the kingdom was as distinctive and as much his own as his idea of the Messiah. As he found the Father sovereign in his own heart and life, he went forth to induce all men to accept this blessed sovereignty and to enjoy all the satisfactions and privileges of the Father's love. The Messianic reign resolves itself into the rule of holy love in the universe of matter and of mind. The kingdom is both a present possession and a future attainment. Thus all ceremonial and national conditions for sharing in the blessings of the kingdom were abolished, and the ethical conditions alone remained for all men in all ages.

The kingdom is more than an individual experience. "It involves new social relations and indeed a new and heavenly society on this earth, a society in which the will of God would be done as perfectly, unanimously, and joyously as in heaven itself." A new social order was a necessary consequence of Jesus' work.

In answer to the question whether Jesus accepted at least in part the apocalyptic and catastrophic idea of the Messiah and the kingdom, the author gives "a modified 'yes,' if we are to hold to our gospel data." Yet he denies that Jesus changed his fundamental spiritual attitude and conceptions when he adopted the apocalyptic form. "He took the apt apocalyptic form, familiar to all Jews, and through that taught them figuratively things which he could not have expounded literally and definitely." The author is fully conscious of the difficulties in explaining the apocalyptic elements in the teaching of Jesus, and, while his explanations may not be wholly convincing to readers of different points of view, his interpretation is well worth pondering and is commendable because of the frankness with which he faces the whole issue.

At some length we have described the salient conclusions of the author because we consider his book brief, simple, and popular as it is, to be one of the noteworthy contributions of an American scholar to the theological literature of the past year. It is positive and constructive, based upon a thorough knowledge of the results of New Testament criticism and a recognition of the difficulties in the way of an historical interpretation of Jesus and his work. In a most satisfactory way the author has avoided the

untenable views of the Christ of dogma, as well as the apocalyptic Messiah of many modern scholars. He finds the Christ to have been far more than the child of his age, yea superior to prophets and kings of all ages, and yet he fails to see in him all that philosophic theologians have speculated about him. The essence, however, of what men have attempted to formulate in christological statements and the abiding hope which is embodied in apocalyptic visions, are conserved in the spiritual character and the ethical ideals of Jesus and his kingdom. At the close of the last chapter the author says: "In our marvellous world-history, Jesus is the greatest marvel of all. No one can ever take his place. All future saviors will acknowledge his supremacy and finality. His energy seems exhaustless and indeed increasing. . . . This Jesus, so strangely and uniquely full of God, is Lord in a sphere beyond the reach of our highest thought. He therefore demands and deserves the wonder, reverence, love and supreme devotion of every human being."

GEO. W. RICHARDS.

THE OPEN DOOR. By Hugh Black. Fleming H. Revell Company. Pp. 224. Price \$1.00 net.

In the first paragraph the author defines the purpose of his book and states the reason for its title. Its purpose is "to suggest a certain attitude towards the world and life." The common figure of speech, "The Open Door," chosen for the title, indicates that general attitude. We are to face the future with the spirit of hope, and hope is based on the fact that ours is not a static, but an evolving, world. The Open Door is a symbol of life itself which unfolds continuously from the lower to the higher, out of the past into the present, and out of the present into the future. In the political, social, intellectual, and moral spheres everything is in process of becoming—doors are open and through them one may enter upon a larger and fuller life. The Open Door means progress, opportunity, inspiration, faith, courage, hope. "Complete democracy when it comes will still further open wide all the doors into the richest possibilities of human life."

The author discusses life from the viewpoint of an evolutionist and yet is a prophet of personal responsibility. He proclaims a causal, not a casual, universe, and yet he insists that man is not the victim of necessity, but the arbiter of his destiny. He demands obedience of law, and yet he preaches the necessity and the efficacy of divine grace. Idealist, as he is to the core, he is not a visionary, but recognizes the value and function of things material and temporal. While he is controlled by democratic ideals, he stands for culture and restraint as the criteria of the highest type of manhood and womanhood.

Those, who have read one or more of the many books which the

author has written, need not be told of the charm of his style. It is chaste, crisp, gripping, vigorous in thought, pulsating with emotion, and buoyant with a wholesome optimism. His paragraphs are adorned with epigrams, replete with illustrations, bristling with allusions to biblical and classical lore, and rich in incidents drawn from wide reading and a close observation of men and affairs.

The book contains nine chapters, each of which seems to have been a sermon, at least contains much sermonic material. The chapter headings are the following: The Open Door, The Laws of the Open Door, The Shut Door, The Doorways of Tradition, The Magic Door, The Lure of the Open Door, The Door of Opportunity, The Adventure of the Open Door, The Last Open Door.

GEO. W. RICHARDS.

A MAN'S REACH OR SOME CHARACTER IDEALS. By Charles Edward Locke. New York, Eaton & Mains. Pp. 278. Price \$1.00.

Each of the seventeen chapters in this volume seems to have been originally a sermon; if not, it may easily be turned into one. While the chapters have widely differing headings, there is a unity of though running through all of them. The binding thread is the necessity of having and of realizing ideals. Only men of ideals have power and destiny. Every notable achievement has its source and motive in a dream, a vision, an aspiration. To use the author's words in the Foreword: "From the days when the Father of the Faithful went forth from Chaldea, 'not knowing whither he went,' down to the eloquent Roman orator who said, 'Ideals are overtures of immortality,' and on to Mazzini, who taught the young men of Italy 'to love and venerate ideals, because ideals are the word of God,' earnest men have been in pursuit of their fondest dreams. Such men have momentum and destination."

The table of contents contains a variety of subjects, each one arousing interest because it is directly related to life. Among others are the following: Ideals and What They Cost; Heroism in Everyday Life; The Cure of Doubt; What is Life; Reverence; Getting Along With Folks; Master, Say On.

The author writes in a popular style and, by reason of the form and substance of his discourse, appeals to the general reader. The minister will find suggestive and stimulating lines of thought; the youth will be stirred to high resolves and noble endeavor. The chapters are adorned with poetic quotations, and numerous illustrations from history, science, and daily life. A book of this type well deserves a place in the library of the home, the school, and the town.

GEO. W. RICHARDS.